

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

Original Application No.180/00823/2017

Tuesday, this the 3rd day of November 2020

C O R A M :

**HON'BLE Mr.P.MADHAVAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE Mr.K.V.EAPEN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

1. Neena Valerian,
Aged 37 years, W/o.John Joseph,
SCP/Mayyanad, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Thekkaruvath, Mathilil P.O., Kollam.
2. Suja.S.,
Aged 32 years, W/o.Rajesh R.,
SCP/Ochira, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Sivasakthi, Pada North, Karunagapally.
3. Mini Krishnan,
Aged 31 years, D/o.Krishnan,
SCP/Cheppad, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Aiswarya, Puthiyavila P.O., Kayamkulam.
4. Rejitha M.C.,
Aged 33 years, W/o.Sujith,
SCP/Mulankunnathukavau,
Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Narangilil House, Viyyur, Trichur.
5. Sandhya.V.,
Aged 29 years, W/o.Binu G Nair,
SCP/Cheppad, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Sreerangath, Pada North, Karunagapally.
6. Manuja.S.,
Aged 27 years, W/o.Akhil.A.,
SCP/Trivandrum Central,
Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Mangalassery Veedu, Kathiruvilla,
Kallara, Trivandrum.
7. Deepa.K.S.,
Aged 39 years, W/o.Sunil.D.Nath,
SCP/Irinjalakuda, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Vallookkattil House, Puthenpedika, Trichur.

.2.

8. Vincy.P.Vincent,
Aged 35 years, W/o.Jovan John,
SCP/Pookunnam, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Cherangadan, Kanimangalam P.O., Trichur.
9. Remya.V.P.,
Aged 27 years, W/o.Renjith,
SCP/Pookunnam, Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Vattaparambil House, Brahmakulam P.O., Trichur.
10. Anu.M.Soman,
Aged 27 years, W/o.Manumohan,
SCP/Ernakulam Marshalling Yard,
Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Manalil House, Pothanikadu P.O., Ernakulam.
11. Deepthi Thilak,
Aged 27 years, D/o.Thilakan,
SCP, Alappuzha Railway Station,
Trivandrum Division, Southern Railway.
Residing at Vadakkechirangethil,
North Aryad P.O., Alappuzha. ...Applicants

(By Advocate M/s.Varkey & Martin)

v e r s u s

1. Union of India represented by General Manager,
Southern Railway, Chennai – 3.
2. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway, Trivandrum – 695 014. ...Respondents

(By Advocate Mrs.Girija.K.Gopal)

This application having been heard on 21st October 2020, the Tribunal on 3rd November 2020 delivered the following:

ORDER

Mr. K.V. EAPEN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

The eleven applicants are working as Sweeper-cum-Porters (SCP) in Pay Band (PB) Rs.5200-20200/- with Grade Pay (GP) Rs.1800/- in the Transportation Department of Trivandrum Division of Southern Railway. They seek a relief that their past regular service prior to ‘inter-divisional transfer’ to Trivandrum Division be eligible for consideration as qualifying

.3.

service for promotion. The applicants were initially appointed in Tiruchirappalli Division of Southern Railway after selection by the Railway Recruitment Cell. All were appointed as SCP in the said division at various dates in the year 2014. The last person to be appointed was on 01.08.2014. After completion of the prescribed period, they applied for an 'inter-divisional transfer' to Trivandrum Division of Southern Railway. The transfers took place in January, 2016. The copies of the orders posting some of them to Trivandrum Division at their own request as SCP in the PB Rs.5200-20200/- with GP Rs.1800/- on bottom seniority in recruitment grade are at Annexure A-2 and Annexure A-3. In the order at A-3 it has been specifically mentioned that the transfer is a "*one-way request transfer*" and that the SCP will take *bottom most seniority to all Permanent/Temporary officiating SCPs in PB Rs.5200-20200/- with GP Rs.1800/- as on the date of joining in the new seniority unit*. It has also been indicated in the Order that they *should not seek retransfer to the parent Division* at a later date.

2. After joining the Trivandrum Division, the applicants were posted, vide orders at Annexure A-4 and by other such similar orders, to various stations under the Trivandrum Division. It was indicated in the Annexure A-4 order that the said transfers are subject, among others, to the following conditions :

1. *They will rank junior most to all permanent/temporary employees in the respective seniority unit on the date of their joining.*

xxxxxxxxxxx

.4.

5. *They will not seek transfer to his parent seniority unit at a later date.*

xxxxxxx

7. *They would prepared to serve anywhere at TVC Divn. at the decision of the competent authority.*

3. After working in their new unit for some time, the applicants came across the two notifications dated 22.08.2017 and 30.06.2017 respectively at Annexure A-5 and Annexure A-6, issued by the respondents. The first notification relating to conduct of selection for promotion of employees in categories carrying GP Rs.1800/- of Operating and Commercial Department of Trivandrum Division to the post of Ticket Examiner in level 3 of pay matrix Rs.5200-20200/- GP Rs.1900/- upgraded to GP Rs.2000/- pre-revised scale against 33 1/3% of Departmental Promotion Quota (Annexure A-5). The second notification related to promotion of Group D staff to Group C against 16 2/3% Limited Departmental Competitive Examination (LDCE) quota in the category of Commercial Clerks in level 3 of pay matrix (PB-1) Rs.5200-20200 + GP Rs.2000/-. In this OA, we are concerned mainly with the notification at Annexure A-6 and its implications for the applicants. In the said Annexure A-6, at the 4th Paragraph, it has been indicated as follows:

“Applicants should have put in a minimum of two years of regular service in the concerned seniority unit as on the date of this notification. However, this will not apply in case of SC/ST candidates.”

4. The Applicants applied for their consideration for promotion as per the notification at Annexure A-6. When the eligibility list was prepared they found, however, that their names were not included on the ground that they had not completed the requisite years of service in the same seniority unit.

.5.

This was reflected in the impugned order at Annexure A-7 wherein in the list of employees who had volunteered for the selection to the post of Commercial Clerk but have not been considered for the reasons noted against each it has been mentioned “*not completed 2 years in the same seniority unit*”. The applicants have understood this to mean that they were not included in the eligibility list only for the reason that they have not completed 2 years of service after joining the Trivandrum Division on bottom seniority; and that they similarly will not be considered for promotion to the post of Ticket Examiners for the said reason. They claim this as highly arbitrary, illegal and unsustainable and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. They submit that their past service in the Tiruchirappalli division should be reckoned along with their present service as qualifying service for promotion.

5. The applicants have sought the following reliefs:

- (a) Call for the records leading to the issue of Annexure A-7 and quash the same to the extent it denies consideration to the applicants for the reason that they have not completed 2 years of service in the same seniority unit.
- (b) Declare that the applicants are eligible for consideration of their past regular service prior to inter-divisional transfer as qualifying for promotion and to direct the respondents accordingly.
- (c) Direct the respondents to consider the applicants for the selection which has been initiated by A5 and A6 notification.
- (d) Grant such other relief, which this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

6. The interim relief prayed for by the applicants was to direct the respondents to provisionally permit them to appear in the written examination which was proposed to be conducted pursuant to Annexure A-5 and Annexure A-6 notifications pending a final decision on the application. When the matter was moved before this Tribunal on 12.10.2017, the interim relief as prayed for in the O.A was granted subject to the final outcome of this O.A. As such, the applicants have all taken part in the LDCE.

7. In their reply statement, respondents have submitted that the thrust of the contentions raised by the applicants is that an employee on inter-divisional transfer will only lose seniority, but that the regular service rendered in the erstwhile Division has to be reckoned, along with the service in the present Division, as qualifying service for the eligibility of qualifying service for promotion. As such, the applicants, who were appointed in the year 2014, claim to be eligible for promotion having completed three years of regular service in the GP of Rs.1800/-. The respondents have submitted that this is not-maintainable in law or in fact. As per Paragraph 128 of the Indian Railway Establishment Manual (IREM), Vol.I (at Annexure R-1) it has been indicated that the posts in the category of Commercial Clerks in the pay scale Rs.3200-4900/GP-Rs.2000/Level-3 are to be filled as under:

- (i) 50% by direct recruitment through Railway Recruitment Board;
- (ii) 33-1/2% by promotion by a process of selection from Railways as per procedure prescribed in para 189; and
- (iii) 16-2/3% by promotion entirely on merit of Matriculate Group 'D' employees from eligible categories, as specified by the Zonal Railways for (ii) above, with a minimum of 2 years regular service in the *concerned seniority unit* on the basis of a competitive examination consisting of written test and Record of Service of 85 and 15 marks respectively.

8. The respondents submit that it is clear from the above detailed Paragraph 128 of the IREM Vol.I, that for selection to the post of Commercial Clerk in 16-2/3% LDCE quota, the employee should have 2 years' regular service in the *present seniority unit*, which is a fundamental criterion to be eligible for writing the examination. They also mention that even the employees belonging to the SC/ST category against the 16-2/3% promotion quota will be eligible for consideration for selection for promotion for GP Rs.1900/- (Level-2) only on completion of two years' regular service in the seniority unit concerned, which has been clarified by the Railway Board as per letter dated 01.03.2017 at Annexure R-2. Similarly, for the post of Ticket Examiner (TE) in 33-1/3% promotional quota, employees should have completed 2 years' continuous service in the relevant grade and also satisfy other eligible criteria to participate in the selection process (Annexure R-3). The respondents submit that though all the applicants had volunteered for the posts of 16-2/3% quota, as is evident from Annexure A-2 to Annexure A-4, they have come on inter-divisional transfer to Trivandrum Division only as per orders dated 08.01.2016 and 05.10.2016 and as such, they do not have two years' regular service in the present seniority unit due to which they have not been shortlisted for the examination. They submit that the applicants have not chosen to challenge the instructions on the subject requiring two years' continuous service in the seniority unit concerned as an essential eligibility criterion for applying for the post and therefore they cannot be allowed to challenge the same at this stage. It is further submitted that selection is based on seniority-cum-suitability. To reckon seniority when more than one grades are involved, those who are in the higher grade will be *en bloc* senior to the employees

.8.

who are in the lower grade. In that case, the employees who are in the lower grade will not get the chance to get themselves selected. As such, it has been submitted that if the applicants' prayers are conceded, the employees in the GP Rs.1800/- will not get a chance to be placed in the 33-1/3% promotional quota. The respondents, accordingly submit that the applicants are not entitled to any benefits as sought for in the O.A and this Tribunal may dismiss the O.A accordingly.

9. In their rejoinder, the applicants have produced copies of two Notifications issued by the Madurai Division of Southern Railway inviting applications for filling up the posts of Ticket Examiner and Commercial Clerk against 16-2/3% LDCE quota at Annexure A-8 and Annexure A-9. In Annexure A-9, which is a notification dated 10.12.2017 issued by the Madurai Division of Southern Railway for selection to the post of Commercial Clerk in Level-3 of the Pay Matrix RSRP Rules-2016 (corresponding Pay Band Rs.5200-20200/- with Grade Pay Rs.2000/-) against 16-2/3% LDCE quota, it has clearly been indicated under 'Service Conditions' that the employees should have put in minimum 2 years of continuous service including substitute service as on the date of issue of the letter i.e. 10.12.2017. These notifications, in the view of the applicants, fortify their case as they do not make any distinction in relation to the different places that the employees may have worked in and just prescribe a minimum of two years continuous service for being eligible for selection.

10. We have gone through all the documents provided and have heard learned counsel for the applicants, Shri. Martin G. Thottan (for M/s. Varkey & Martin) and learned counsel for the respondents, Smt. Girija K. Gopal. Learned counsel for the applicants has brought to our notice three separate Supreme Court decisions which he claims are relevant for consideration in this matter. These are as follows:

1. **Union of India & Ors. v. C.N. Ponnappan, (1996) 1 SCC 524.**
2. **Scientific Advisor to Raksha Mantri & Anr. v. V.M. Joseph, (1998) 5 SCC 305.**
3. **M.M. Thomas & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors., (2018) 1 SCC (L&S) 96; (2017) 13 SCC 722.**

Learned counsel for the applicants has taken us through the reasoning in *M. M. Thomas (supra)*. He has particularly drawn our attention to Paragraphs 6, 7, 9 and 10 of the judgment wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has recorded as follows:

“6. Thus, the only issue before us is whether under the aforesaid Rule, the candidates who seek promotion through departmental competitive examination for the post of EO/AO, should have served, both in their earlier place of posting and their present place of posting for a period of five years, or whether the candidates should have served for five years in the region where they seek promotion, which in this case is Kerala region.

7. Having heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and upon perusal of the record, we are of the view that the words of the aforesaid Rule require five years' regular service "in the respective regions". Thus, these words must be understood to mean that the candidates should have served in the respective regions, that is, the regions where they were posted earlier and the region where they seek promotion all together for five years. Thus, if a candidate has served in one region and then transferred to another, and seeks promotion in that region, the Rule does not require that the candidate must have acquired experience of five years in the region where he seeks promotion, for being considered eligible. What is necessary is a total experience of five years. This must

necessarily be so because the service to which the rival parties belong, is an All India Services, in which the country is demarcated into several regions. In All India Service, the officers are posted from one region to the other in a routine manner. The purpose of the Rule is that such officers are not deprived of their experience in the feeder cadre merely because they have been transferred from one place to another.

8. xxxxxxxxxx

9. *In a similar context, this Court in Union of India v. C.N. Ponnappan (1996) 1 SCC 524 held that an employee who is transferred from one unit to another on compassionate ground, though placed at the bottom of seniority list is entitled to have the service rendered at an earlier unit, counted for the purpose of eligibility for promotion in the unit in which he is transferred. It was observed in Para 4 as follows: (SCC p.526)*

“4. The service rendered by an employee at the place from where he was transferred on compassionate grounds is regular service. It is no different from the service rendered at the place where he is transferred. Both the periods are taken into account for purpose of leave and retiral benefits. The fact that as a result of transfer he is placed at the bottom of the seniority list at the place of transfer does not wipe out his service at the place from where he was transferred. The said services, being regular service in the grade, has to be taken into account as part of his experience for the purpose of eligibility for promotion and it cannot be ignored only on the ground that it was not rendered at the place where he has been transferred.”

10. *When confronted once again with the similar question in Scientific Advisor to Raksha Mantri and Anr. v. V.M. Joseph (1998) 5 SCC 305, this Court relying on earlier decision in Union of India (supra) held that the length of service rendered on an equivalent post in another organization before the transfer counts, for determining the eligibility for promotion though such service may not count for seniority.”*

11. We note that in *M. M. Thomas (supra)* the appellants were working as Social Security Assistants (SSAs) in the Karnataka/Tamil Nadu regions of the Employees Provident Fund Organization (EPFO). They were transferred to the Kerala region and kept at the bottom in the seniority list. A notification was issued to fill up the promotion post of Enforcement Officer/Accounts Officer (EO/AO) in the Kerala region. The appellants and the

private party-respondents participated in the aforesaid examination. However, the inclusion of the names of the appellants, who were at rank numbers 1, 2, 4 and 5 respectively in the rank list and promotion list published, was challenged by the private party-respondents on the ground that they are not eligible. This Tribunal in O.A.Nos.723 and 970 of 2010 filed by the private party-respondents agreed with the contention and held that the appellants do not have the requisite experience in the Kerala region as on the date on which the vacancies were notified, thereby setting aside the inclusion of their names in the rank list for promotion to the posts of EO/AO. The Honourable High Court of Kerala affirmed the order dated 19.07.2011 passed by this Tribunal.

12. The Appellants in *M. M. Thomas (supra)* then took the matter to the Honourable Supreme Court of India. The Honourable Apex Court, while deciding in favour of the Appellants, noted in their judgement that the relevant extract of the Rule that governs the eligibility of the appellants reads as follows:

“(ii) By promotion on the basis of Departmental Competitive Examination.

*#.....and DEO (Grade C) with three years' regular service in the scale of Rs.5000-8000/- including those DEO (Grade C) who have already put in 5 years' regular service in DEO (Grade A) and Social Security Assistants/Assistants/Stenographers/and DEO (Grades A and B) with 5 years' regular service in the scale of Rs.4000-6000/- in the **respective regions.**”*

13. Learned counsel for the Appellants in the present matter submits that in *M.M.Thomas (supra)*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has decided in that the term “*in the respective regions*” to mean that the candidates should have served

in the region where they were posted earlier and the region where they seek promotion, together for 5 years. Thus, if a candidate has served in one region and was then transferred to another and was seeking promotion in that region, the Rules do not require that he should have acquired experience of 5 years only in the region where he seeks promotion, for being considered for promotion. What is necessary is a total experience of 5 years. Learned counsel submits that a similar logic would apply in the case of the applicants in the present O.A, where they have completed more than two years continuous service if we count the earlier service as SCP in Tiruchirappalli Division from 2014 onwards up to the date of issue of notification at Annexure A-6. He submits that the Hon'ble Apex Court decision in *M.M.Thomas (supra)* has squarely settled the matter and as such the O.A should be allowed. In addition, learned counsel for the applicants submitted that even notwithstanding the above logic, the interpretation of the phrase “*concerned seniority unit*” in the Rules should be understood in the context of the post of Sweeper Cum Porter (SCP) in which the applicants have served for more than two years and that it does not refer to any particular geographical area, i.e. Tiruchirappalli or Trivandrum, as transfer between one region to another and between one division to another is a routine matter as noted in *M.M. Thomas (supra)*. The Hon'ble Apex Court had found in that matter that the service to which the rival parties belong is an All-India Service, in which the country is demarcated into several regions and in such All-India Service the officers are posted from one region to the other in a routine manner.

14. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted in response that a simple and plain reading of the Rule is required without unnecessary interpretation, as has been upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of cases, when considering the relevant Paragraph 128 of IREM, Vol.I covering the cases of the applicants. The paragraph has the phrase “*concerned seniority unit*” which is to be noted as “*unit*” in the singular form and not plural; whereas in the case of *M.M. Thomas (supra)* the Rules mentioned “*in the respective regions*” i.e. regions indicated in the plural form. Learned Counsel submits that the finding of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *M.M. Thomas (supra)* are not applicable in this matter, as in that matter the Rules themselves allowed regular service “*in the respective regions*”, i.e., more than one region, whereas in this case the Rule mentions only “*concerned seniority unit*”, which can refer only to the specific unit where the employee has been posted in. Second, the post of SCP is not of the nature of an All-India Service as was the case of the Social Security Assistants of the EPFO in *M.M. Thomas (supra)*, where the honourable Apex Court noted that officers are posted from one region to another in a routine manner. In this case, going by the Railways Order at Annexure A-4, it has been clearly indicated at point No.1 of the Conditions, that the applicants will rank junior most to all permanent/temporary employees in the ***respective seniority unit*** on the date of their joining. Learned counsel submits that unlike the EPFO, it is each Division in the Railways which is the relevant ‘unit’ as far as an employee in the grade of SCP is concerned. Thus, the date of joining in that unit would be the date for counting the length of service for qualification to the post of Commercial Clerks. Further, she submits that it would be unfair to employees higher than the applicants in the unit seniority list, if someone

with lower seniority is considered as eligible for promotion over somebody at a higher level with longer length of service in that particular unit but without the sufficient qualifying service of two years. Hence, a plain reading of Paragraph 128 of IREM Vol.I should be relied upon without going into any other interpretations.

15. In regard to the point made by the learned counsel for the applicant relating to the qualifications prescribed in the Madurai Division, learned counsel for respondent has submitted in an additional reply statement that the applicants have not arrayed the Divisional Officials concerned to enable them to submit their averments that in the notification against 16-2/3% promotional quota, a *residential* period of two years is not required. Also, they have not produced a copy of any posting order issued to the employees who are not having two years residential period in the seniority unit concerned. Learned counsel submitted that the notification issued by the Madurai Division need not be considered and that the facts *M.M. Thomas (supra)* are very different and cannot be relied upon in the present instance.

16. We have considered these contending issues/ documents and have also perused the decisions of the Honourable Apex Court as produced. We note that the Annexure A-2 and Annexure A-3 orders have certain features in addition to the points made by learned counsel for the respondents which, in our view, make it further clear that the “concerned seniority unit” being referred to in the relevant Rules relate at least in the case of these Applicants, to the Trivandrum Division to which they were posted from

Tiruchirappalli Division. The first of these features is that it is noted in both Annexure A-2 and Annexure A-3 orders that this is a “*one-way transfer*” which in a sense seems to imply a permanent posting in a new unit. Second, there is a clear indication in Annexure A-3 as well as in Annexure A-4 orders that the transferred employees will rank not only junior most in the ‘respective seniority unit’ on the date of their joining, but that they will also not be transferred to the parent seniority unit at a later date. This seems again to indicate that the parent unit is being treated by the Railways as a clear and separate unit in comparison to the unit where they have been transferred. We therefore find that their earlier service cannot be counted for the purpose of calculating the necessary experience qualification of two years.

17. We note in addition that the facts in the cited cases are not similar to the present matter. For example, in the case of *C.N. Ponnappan (supra)*, the relevant rules required “*8 years regular service in the grade*” for promotion from Lower Division Clerk to the post of Upper Division Clerk. Here the operative portion was “*regular service in the grade*” and the Hon'ble Apex Court ruled that the service rendered by an employee at the place from where he was transferred on compassionate ground is regular service and is no different from the service rendered at the place to which he is transferred. The Rules only mentioned in the grade and did not indicate that it should be at the same place. Similarly, in *V.M. Joseph (supra)*, no relevant Rules are mentioned and it was only held that the period of service rendered by him at the earlier place where he held a permanent post and had acquired permanent status cannot be excluded from consideration for determining his eligibility for promotion, though he may have been placed at the bottom of

the seniority list at the transferred place. It was found that eligibility for promotion cannot be confused with seniority as they are two different and distinct factors. However, as noted, there are no Rules that have been indicated. Thus, in *V M Joseph (supra)*, as in the case of *C.N. Ponnappan (supra)*, work in a specific, concerned service unit does not appear to have been part of the relevant Recruitment Rules/Guidelines for promotion and it was only indicated that there should be a prescribed length of regular service in a particular grade. This is not the same as it is in the present matter under consideration.

18. Further even in the case of *M.M. Thomas (supra)*, while service in different regions were allowed to be clubbed, it was also noted that this was specifically allowed in the EPFO. The Honourable Apex Court noted in the judgment in Paragraph 8 that in the transfer order of the appellants issued by the Regional PF Commissioner (HRM), EPFO, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, addressed to the Regional PF Commissioners in charge of the Region Tamil Nadu, the following was mentioned as a condition of transfer: “*His/Her past service rendered in the cadre of SSA will be counted for the purpose of appearing in the departmental examination.....*”. The Hon'ble Apex Court recorded that this above condition of transfer fortifies their view regarding the intent and purpose of the promotion rule. In contrast in the matter under consideration, the transfer orders issued by the Railways at Annexure A-2, Annexure A-3 and Annexure A-4 do not in any way indicate that the past service in the earlier unit will count towards the promotion in the new unit. On the other hand, the units are indicated as clear and separate establishments; this is fortified

by the various conditions as mentioned earlier which make a distinction between the parent seniority unit and the seniority unit to which the employee is posted.

19. We therefore do not allow the reliefs sought for in the O.A and dismiss the same without costs. In passing we note that the applicants are low-level staff with limited avenues for further advancement/promotion within the Railways. It has been informed to us by the learned counsel for the applicants that the Trivandrum Division has since not issued any further call for volunteers for promotion to the posts of Commercial Clerks from the pool of Group D employees, after the last one at Annexure A-6. We are not aware of the reasons for the same, but we note that by simple efflux of time the applicants have already completed two years of service within the Trivandrum Division. As such, they appear to be eligible in case of any future selection for promotion as per the Rules. We hope that the Railways will consider this aspect positively, if there are no other legal or other impediments, in the overall interest of employee morale and motivation.

(Dated this the 3rd day of November 2020)

K.V. EAPEN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

P. MADHAVAN
JUDICIAL MEMBER

asp

List of Annexures in O.A.No.180/00823/2017

- 1. Annexure A-1** – A copy of the offer of appointment issued to the 7th applicant under letter No.T/P 564/II/Tfc Admn/Group-D dated 29.05.2014.
 - 2. Annexure A-2** – A copy of the Office Order No.79/2016 dated nil issued on behalf of the Divisional Personnel Officer, Trichy Division.
 - 3. Annexure A-3** – A copy of the Office Order No.91/2016 dated 24.11.2016 issued on behalf of the Divisional Personnel Officer, Trichy Division.
 - 4. Annexure A-4** – A copy of the Office Order No.T.65/2016/Tfc Gr.D dated 24.10.2016 issued on behalf of the 2nd respondent.
 - 5. Annexure A-5** – A copy of the Notification No.V/P 531/III/TE/Vol.XII dated 22.08.2017 issued on behalf of the 2nd respondent.
 - 6. Annexure A-6** – A copy of the Notification bearing No.V/P.608/III/CC/LDCE/Vol.III dated 30.06.2017 issued on behalf of the 2nd respondent.
 - 7. Annexure A-7** – A copy of the Letter bearing No.V/P 531/III/CC/Vol.IX dated 13.09.2017 issued by the 2nd respondent.
 - 8. Annexure A-8** – A copy of the Notification No.U/P.561/III/TE's/16-2/3% dated 20.05/05.06.2017.
 - 9. Annexure A9-** – A copy of the Notification No.V/P.531/III/CC's/33-1/3% PRO/Vol.V dated 19.12.2017.
 - 10. Annexure R-1** – True extract of paragraph 128 of Indian Railway Establishment Manual, Vol.I.
 - 11. Annexure R-2** – A copy of the Railway Board's letter No.E(NG)I-2016/CFP/5 dated 01.03.2017 (RB Estt.No.18/2017).
 - 12. Annexure R-3** – A copy of the Railway Board's letter No.E(NG)I-2015/CFP/8 dated 21.04.2017 (RB Estt.No.38/2017).
-