

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

DATE OF DECISION : 04-10-1991

O.A. 1792/88

Jogeshwar Mahanta ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1826/88

D. P. Sravastava ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1833/88

R. K. Gupta ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1841/88

Varinder Kumar ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1856/88

Chanderesh Nigam ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1857/88

Rajinder Kumar ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1859/88

Suresh Chander ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

O.A. 1861/88

Ami Lal Taksh ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India ... Respondents

was employed as Laboratory Assistant. Applicant in O.A. 1884/88 was also employed as Laboratory Assistant.

The applicants in all these cases have a common grievance and have also prayed for a similar relief. Their grievance is that the training allowance which was sanctioned to them, in pursuance of the O.M. dated 7.2.1986

(Annexure-I) issued by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, vide Ministry of Home Affairs

letter dated 1.7.1986 (Annexure-III) read with office order dated 30.7.1986 (Annexure-IV), has been stopped with retrospective effect from 1.1.1986 and recovery of

(a) (i) the allowance paid for the period 1.1.1986 to 31.3.1987

(has been ordered vide Ministry of Home Affairs letter

dated 28.4.1987 (Annexure-VI) in pursuance of Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions O.M. dated

31.3.1987 (Annexure-V). The relief prayed for in all

these cases is to quash the aforesaid orders of 31.3.1987

and 28.4.1987 and for a direction to the respondents to implement the original policy order in O.M. dated 7.2.1986

on revised scales from time to time with 12 per cent interest

on the arrears due to them. The representations made

against the impugned orders are said to have not been

replied to.

2. As the applicants in all these O.A.s are employed

in the same organisation, they have a common grievance,

whereas the relief prayed for is virtually identical and the

issues of law and facts involved in these cases are

common, it will be convenient to dispose of all these

discrepancy O.A.s by a common judgment.

3. The relevant facts, stated briefly, are as

below :

Training Division of the Department of Personnel & Training, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions issued an O.M. dated 7.2.1986 (Annexure-I) in which guidelines were laid down with a view to attract the best trainer talent in the faculty of the training institutions under the control of different Ministries/ Departments. These guidelines inter-alia provide that -

(1) the faculty members who join the training institutions on deputation (emphasis supplied), their emoluments may be raised by 30% of the total emoluments which they would be getting in their cadre, while posted in the field;

(2) so far as permanent faculty members of training institutions were concerned, suitable proposals for enhancement of their pay/special pay on similar lines should be worked out by the Department concerned (emphasis supplied); (3) other things being equal, those who have had a successful tenure on the faculty of training institutions may be given preference in matters like promotion, and on the completion of the tenure with the training institutions, each officer should be given the facility of three options relating to his next posting and the Department concerned would arrange for posting according to the option exercised by the officer; and (4) each child of the member of the faculty continuing his education at a centre other than the place of training institution, should be given leave travel concession twice a year, to be able to join his parents. It was also stated in this O.M. that "this Ministry may please be kept informed of action taken in this regard from time to time".

4. In pursuance of the above O.M., Ministry of Home Affairs issued O.M. dated 19.2.1986 (Annexure-II) asking for information/particulars prescribed therein in respect

14

for nomination to the Board of Control and the Board of Education.

- 5 -

On the behalf of the Government of India, the Ministry of Home Affairs issued a circular dated 28.2.1986, which directed the Director of the training institutions under the control of the Director of Home Affairs to issue a circular to the respective CPOs by 28.2.1986. The Ministry of Home Affairs directed that the circular issued by the Director of Home Affairs should be forwarded to the Director, ICFS in the letter dated 1.7.1986 (Annexure-III) which letter inter-alia provided for payment of training allowance in respect of the members of the teaching/training faculty of the academy (i.e., Director, Additional Director, Professor, Superintendent of Police, Assistant Directors, Readers, Lecturer, Senior Scientific Assistants and Laboratory Assistants). In respect of the members of the teaching/training faculty, who were on deputation, the training allowance was to be paid at the rate of 30 per cent of the emoluments received in the parent cadre in the last posting, reduced by the amount of emoluments based on special pay admissible in the Institute on deputation, and in respect of the members of the faculty continuing his education at a centre other than New Delhi/Delhi, was to be given leave travel concessions twice a year, to be able to join his parents.

These orders were to take effect from 1.1.1986 but were made subject to other general or specific orders issued by the Government from time to time on the subject.

(Emphasis supplied).

Soon after the appointment of Dr. S. S. Shrivastava as the Director of ICFS, he issued a circular dated 1.7.1986, which directed the Director of Home Affairs to issue a circular to the Director of the training institutions under the control of the Director of Home Affairs to issue a circular to the respective CPOs by 28.2.1986. The Ministry of Home Affairs directed that the circular issued by the Director of Home Affairs should be forwarded to the Director, ICFS in the letter dated 1.7.1986 (Annexure-III) which letter inter-alia provided for payment of training allowance in respect of the members of the teaching/training faculty of the academy (i.e., Director, Additional Director, Professor, Superintendent of Police, Assistant Directors, Readers, Lecturer, Senior Scientific Assistants and Laboratory Assistants). In respect of the members of the teaching/training faculty, who were on deputation, the training allowance was to be paid at the rate of 30 per cent of the emoluments received in the parent cadre in the last posting, reduced by the amount of emoluments based on special pay admissible in the Institute on deputation, and in respect of the members of the faculty continuing his education at a centre other than New Delhi/Delhi, was to be given leave travel concessions twice a year, to be able to join his parents.

5. In pursuance of MHA's letter dated 1.7.1986 (supra) an office order was issued by ICFS (Annexure-IV) conveying the sanction of the Director to the grant of training allowance as admissible under the aforesaid letter of the MHA w.e.f. 1.1.1986. The names of all the applicants in the cases before us are included in the list of 18 persons mentioned in this office order.

6. The Training Division of the Department of Personnel & Training issued an O.M. dated 31.3.1987, to all Ministries/Departments of Government of India with reference to their O.M.s of even number dated 7.2.1986, 17.4.1986 and 3.6.1986. It was stated therein that taking into account the introduction of the Fourth Pay Commission pay scales and the various references received from the Ministries/Departments, revised guidelines were issued in supersession of the previous OMs from the Ministry referred to above. It was inter-alia provided in these revised guidelines that (1) when an employee of the Government joins a training institution meant for training Government officials, as a faculty member other than as a permanent faculty member (emphasis supplied), he will be given a training allowance at the rate of 30 per cent of his basic pay drawn from time to time in the revised scales of pay; (2) the training allowance will not form part of 'pay' as defined in F.R. 9(21) but will count for purposes of leave salary; (3) the training allowance will be admissible to faculty members whose work is to impart training/teaching and not to others; (4) these guidelines will not be applicable to the faculty members recruited specifically for training institutions; (5) that incentive outlined in this O.M. and consequential orders will take effect from 1.1.1986 in so far as these relate to training institutions.

(Annex-14.29), (5) the sub-mission of the Ministry of Home Affairs

primarily meant for training Group 'A' officials and
from January, 1987 for training institutions primarily
meant for training other officials; and (6) each Ministry/
Department will issue orders in pursuance of these guidelines
in consultations with their Integrated Finance. It was
in pursuance of the revised guidelines in this O.M. that

the Ministry of Home Affairs issued orders on 28.4.1987

(Annexure-VI) in supersession of the sanction earlier
issued. These orders are in consonance with the revised
guidelines issued by the Ministry of Personnel etc. As a
result the training allowance earlier sanctioned by the
MHA was stopped w.e.f. April, 1987 onwards to the faculty
members recruited specifically for training institutions
and recoveries of payments made to them till then were
directed to be made. The MHA also made their orders
effective from 1.1.1986 and until further orders.

7. It may also be stated here that the prayer for
interim relief to the effect that the recovery of training
allowance already paid from 1.1.1986 to 31.3.1987, be
stayed till the final decision in the O.A., was specifically
declined in O.A. 1859/88 by the Tribunal vide order dated
10.11.1988, and that no order granting interim relief was
passed in O.A. Nos. 1792/88, 1872/88, 1884/88, 1833/88
and 1841/88. In other cases the recovery of the training
allowance already made was stayed.

8. The respondents have contested all the cases by
filing their return.

9. We have perused the material on record and also heard
the learned counsel for the parties.

8

10. The applicants have assailed the impugned orders dated 31.3.1987 and dated 28.4.1987 on the grounds :

(1) that no reasonable opportunity was given to explain before the training allowance was terminated; (2) that paying the training allowance to the deputationists and not to the regular incumbents/direct recruits is a violation of Articles 14, 16 and 39 (d) of the Constitution; (3) that an executive order cannot be made effective retrospectively either from 1.1.1986 or from 1.4.1987; (4) that the impugned orders defeat the purpose of improvement in service conditions which was the object of the orders in regard to payment of training allowance; (5) and that severe injustice has been caused by depriving the applicants of the training allowance.

11. When the applications were filed, only the Union of India (through the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions) was arrayed as the respondent.

This respondent in its return raised some preliminary objections. One of the preliminary objections was that the O.A. is bad for non-joinder of Ministry of Home Affairs.

Later on the applicants moved miscellaneous petitions for adding (1) the Secretary to the Government of India,

Ministry of Home Affairs, and (2) the Director, ICFS, as additional respondents. These petitions were allowed

and as such, this preliminary objection is no more

sustainable. Another preliminary objection was that the O.A.s are barred by sections 20 and 21 of the Administrative Act, 1985. This objection can also not be sustained

for the simple reason that the applicants have made representations against the impugned orders to which

no reply is shown to have been given and as such there is no case for applying sections 20 and 21 of the Adminis-

8

no violation of the provisions of section 20 of the Act ^{statute bar period} ibid. Secondly, the O.A.s having been filed within limitation, these cannot be barred under section 21 of the Act ibid. Another preliminary objection is that no cause of action had accrued in favour of the applicants against the respondent No.1, and that an illegal order passed in contravention of the rules cannot confer a right on the applicants to claim that the illegality be continued in their case. Whether one of the impugned orders is illegal or not will be dealt with hereinafter, but the mere fact that one of the impugned orders has been issued by the MHA, who has since been made a respondent, this objection raised as preliminary objection on behalf of the applicants ^{original respondent has to be rejected}.

12. The case of respondent No.1, e.g., Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, on merits, is that the O.M. dated 7.2.1986 as partly amended by O.M. dated 17.4.1986 (Annexure-VIII), never sanctioned training allowance to the faculty members directly recruited for the faculty posts in the ICFS. It may be stated here that the amendment vide O.M. dated 17.4.1986 does not relate to the main issue before us as it deals only with the definition of total emoluments on the basis of which 30 per cent increase was to be allowed to faculty members ^{other than the permanent faculty members of the training institutions} other than the permanent faculty members of the training institutions. It is also stated that the need to grant training allowance by way of attracting serving Government servants as deputationist faculty members had arisen because of the following facts :

(i) In most of the training institutions, there has been constant and consistent feedback from the participants that the lectures by permanent faculty members are theoretical and academic and that the lectures should be made more practical for the participants who are serving Govt. Servants.

ii) In order to impart this practical orientation it is necessary to get faculty members on deputation who are serving Govt. Servants and can bring the practical idiom to their lectures.

iii) Such Government Servants are practising administrators not specifically recruited as trainers and are not willing to come over to Training Institutions as faculty members on deputation.

iv) It is, therefore, necessary to attract them by offering them over and above the normal deputation terms, a special incentive by way of training allowance. Such faculty members have been recruited specifically for the job of training and they are fully aware of this fact while joining the Institute.

v) For several years officers who have been going as faculty to their own cadre Training Institutions have been receiving special pay even though these were not deputation posts, as a measure of incentive.

vi) This would not be the case for permanent faculty member as such faculty members have been recruited specifically for the job of training and they are fully aware of this fact while joining the Institute.

It is, therefore, only in the case of deputationists that it was considered necessary to give 30% training allowance in order to attract the best talent suited for faculty job outside their normal scope of vocation.

The contention about violation of Articles 14, 16 and 39(d) of the Constitution has been refuted. It is further stated that no evil has visited the applicants as a result of the guidelines issued by the respondent No.1.

13. In the return filed on behalf of the newly added respondents No.2 and 3, a preliminary objection has been raised that respondents No.2 and 3 have been impleaded when the cause of action against them became time barred. This preliminary objection cannot be sustained.

as the misc. petitions for adding respondents No. 2 and 3 were allowed by the Tribunal. In their reply it is stated that the training/teaching faculty in any training institution under the Government of India consists of two categories of members — (1) regular members who are specifically recruited for faculty posts, and (2) members who are deputationists from other departments of the Government of India, and till 1.1.1986, the regular members of the faculty were drawing pay in the scale sanctioned for such faculty posts, while deputationists members were allowed deputation allowance at certain prescribed rates in addition to their grade pay in their parent departments or their pay was fixed in the pay scale of the deputation post under the normal rates of pay fixation. It is further stated that according to the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Personnel on 7.2.1986 as amended by O.M. dated 17.4.1986, the incentive for the deputationist members of the faculty was to be in the form of an enhancement of their "benefits" and "emoluments" (as defined in the said O.M.s) in their parent cadre by 30 per cent and subject to other conditions as laid down therein. As for the permanent (i.e., regular) members of the faculty, these guidelines envisaged formulation of suitable proposals for enhancement of their pay/special pay on similar lines by the respective departments. It is emphasised that in para 4 of the sanction letter of July, 1986, it was made clear that these orders were subject to other general or specific orders issued by the Government from time to time on the subject. It is also stated that the guidelines issued earlier were specifically revised by the Department of Personnel & Training vide their O.M.

dated 31.3.1987 taking into account the introduction of the Fourth Pay Commission pay scales, and these revised guidelines were effective from 1.1.1986 and were to be followed by all Ministries/Departments of

Government of India. It is in accordance with the revised guidelines that the impugned orders dated

28.4.1987 were issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs.

14. To take up the contention which has been raised

by respondent No.1 as a preliminary objection that an

illegal order passed in contravention of the rules cannot

legally be relied upon to give any claim

confer a right on the applicants to claim that the

illegality will continue in their case, it may be stated

that in the O.M. dated 7.2.1986 addressed to all

Ministries/Departments of the Government of India, the

Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions

had only stated that suitable proposals for enhancement of

the pay/special pay of permanent faculty members of

training institutions on similar lines should be worked

out by the Department concerned. It is on this basis that

the contention of respondent No.1 seems to be that the

Ministries and Departments were probably not authorised

to issue any orders about training allowance to the

permanent faculty members of such institutions. While it

is true that in the aforesaid O.M. specific directions

in regard to the package of training allowance had been

mentioned in respect of faculty members who join training

institutions on deputation only, yet specific orders were

issued by the MHA in their letter dated 1.7.1986 in regard

to the permanent faculty members also, and a copy of the

same had been endorsed to the Training Division of the

Ministry and it is to be noted that the said letter

concerned about the enhanced pay of faculty members

22

Department of Personnel & Training with reference to their O.M. of 7.2.1986, the Department of Personnel & Training does not appear to have raised any objection. Further, the sanction letter issued by the MHA on 1.7.1986 states that this was being issued as per the decision of the President. In this view of the matter, it is not possible to hold that the order dated 1.7.1986 issued by the MHA was illegal; at best it may be considered as being ~~need~~ irregular.

15. One of the main grounds of attack taken up by the applicants is the plea of discrimination and violation of Articles 14, 16 and 39 (d) of the Constitution inasmuch as the training allowance has been continued for the deputationists while it has been withdrawn in case of the permanent faculty members. They have also cited the case of **Telecommunication Research Centre Scientific Officers (Class I) Association & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.** (SLJ 1987 (3) 84) in which their lordships of the Supreme Court had held that when the direct recruits and transferred Field Officers Group 'A' working in the Telecommunication Research Centre discharge the same functions and duties, the qualifications for recruitment prescribed in the case of both classes are the same, and they were in the same pay scales at the comparable levels/grades, it was not justified to deny special pay to one and pay it to one. It is axiomatic that the doctrine of equality before law and equal protection of law as enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution is applicable only to those who are similarly placed and that there can be no equality between unequal. Applicants have not stated that all the factors referred to in the cited case are equal in the cases before us. There is no

Statement of the applicants is that the qualifications of the

material on record to show that the qualifications

prescribed for the deputationists for their recruitment

to their parent cadre and the qualifications prescribed for

recruitment of the permanent faculty members are identical

or equal. Similarly, no parity in their pay scales at

various levels or grades depending on the posts held by the

various applicants has been established or even shown.

It can also not be said that the Recruitment Rules

applicable to the two categories of staff were the same.

All the parameters of the incentive scheme as enunciated

in the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Personnel,

Public Grievances and Pensions clearly highlight the

differences/difference between the two groups

differences/difference in the basic concept.

Thus the plea of discrimination cannot be upheld.

16. A contention has been raised by the applicants

that withdrawal of training allowance amounts to change

in the conditions of service. Obviously no rules in

regard to the introduction of payment of training allowance

exist as none has been referred to in the pleadings of

the parties nor any such rules have been produced before

us. The O.M.s issued by the Training Division of the

Department of Personnel & Training clearly show that these

were guidelines issued to all the Ministries/Departments

of the Government of India. These are undoubtedly

administrative in nature and cannot be deemed to have

created any vested right in favour of the applicants.

Moreover, the orders issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs

on 1.7.1986 clearly state in para 4 thereof that these

are subject to other general or specific orders issued

by the Government from time to time on the subject.

Social, political and economic environment in the country

keeps on changing and in such a dynamic situation policies

of the Government cannot remain static. It is inherent in such a situation that policies undergo change from time to time depending on the requirements of the situation both from macro and micro points of view. It cannot, therefore, be said that the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions did not have the inherent right to revise the guidelines. The reasons for revision are specifically mentioned in the impugned O.M. dated 31.3.1987, e.g., introduction of new scales of pay pursuant to the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission and the various references received from Ministries/Departments. For making revision in the guidelines or in other policy matters in such a situation it is not warranted that all concerned with the matter should be consulted in advance before bringing about the changes in the policy or in the guidelines. Even if the training allowance were to be considered as a part of conditions of service, which in our opinion it is not, even then the Government was competent to effect the change in policy/guidelines. A Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court in the case of Roshan Lal Tandon vs. Union of India & Ors. (AIR 1967 SC 1889) held that "Terms of service can be altered unilaterally by the Government" and that there was no vested contractual right for the Government servant. It was further held that "the legal position of a Government servant is more one of status than of contract", and "The hallmark of status is the attachment to a legal relationship of rights and duties imposed by the public law and not by mere agreement by the parties."

17. Another ground of attack is that an executive order cannot be made effective retrospectively. This contention of the applicants has to be upheld as it is a fundamental principle that any law should be applied only to the future and not to the past.

well settled that while a legislation can be enacted to have retrospective effect, an administrative order can be effective only from the date of issue.

18. The applicants have impugned two orders — (1) the O.M. dated 31.3.1987 by which revised guidelines were issued by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, and (2) the orders issued by the MHA on 28.4.1987, which directly concerned the applicants herein. It is, therefore, not necessary to even partly quash the revised guidelines issued by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions; it would suffice to strike down the following words in para 5 of the orders dated 28.4.1987 (Annexure-VI) :-

"These orders will take effect from 1.1.86"
and similar words.

19. In the light of the foregoing discussion, all these applications are disposed of with the direction that the words "These orders will take effect from 1.1.86" in para 5 of the Ministry of Home Affairs letter No. F.No.27012/5/86-FP.I dated 28th April, 1987 (copy annexed at Annexure-VI) are struck down as illegal. Consequently the applicants shall be entitled to the training allowance sanctioned to them vide Ministry of Home Affairs letter No.27012/42/85-FP.I dated 1st July, 1986 (copy annexed at Annexure-III) read with office order No.3/6/86-ICFS dated 30th April, 1986 (copy annexed at Annexure-IV), issued by the Institute of Criminology & Forensic Science, w.e.f. 1.1.1985 till 27.4.1987, i.e., the date immediately preceding the date on which the revised orders were issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs. The other reliefs

of the same and the application is accordingly dismissed from
the 2020 case and accordingly the relief and expenses given

prayed for by the applicants are disallowed. In the
facts and circumstances of the case we leave the parties
to bear their own costs.

2020 order, dismissed and costs

A copy of this order may be placed on the file
of each of these O.A.s.

Given at the 20th day of December 2020 in the year of our Lord
2020 in the year of our Lord two thousand twenty.

(P. C. JAIN) G. SREEDHARAN NAIR)
MEMBER (A) VICE-CHAIRMAN (J)

Done and signed this 20th day of December 2020

At (Madras) 2020.

Given at the 20th day of December 2020

Given at the 20th day of December 2020 in the year of our Lord
2020 in the year of our Lord two thousand twenty.

Done and signed this 20th day of December 2020

Given at the 20th day of December 2020 in the year of our Lord
2020 in the year of our Lord two thousand twenty.

Done and signed this 20th day of December 2020

Given at the 20th day of December 2020 in the year of our Lord
2020 in the year of our Lord two thousand twenty.

Given at the 20th day of December 2020 in the year of our Lord