

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Ernakulam Bench**

OA No.180/00844/2019

Monday, this the 2nd day of November, 2020

CORAM

Hon'ble Mr.P.Madhavan, Judicial Member

Hon'ble Mr.K.V.Eapen, Administrative Member

K. Anoop Sagar, Aged 40 years,
S/o. P. Kesavan,
Senior Grade Officer of IIS Group B,
News Editor, Regional News Unit,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Thiruvananthapuram - 695 043.
Residing at 101 NCC Nagar, Peroorkada,
Thiruvananthapuram - 695 005.
Mob: 9447500534

Applicant

(Advocate: Mrs. Sumathi Dandapani, Sr.)
Ms.K.Kusumam

Versus

1. Union of India, represented by Secretary,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi - 110 001.
2. Joint Secretary,
Personnel and Administration,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Government of India, Sastri Bhavan,
Dr. Rajendra Prasad Marg,
New Delhi -110 001
3. Chaitanya Prasad, ADG (N&CA),
Doordarshan News, Doordarshan Bhawan II,
Copernicus Marg, New Delhi -110 001.
4. Rashmi Roja Thushara Nair,
Joint Director (News) Regional News Unit,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Thiruvananthapuram - 695K.

5. Head of Office, Doordarshan Kendra,
Prasar Bharathi,
Thiruvananthapuram - 695 043.

6. Registrar of News Papers for India
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
Office of the Registrar of News Papers for India
9th Floor, Soochana Bhavan, CGO Complex
Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110 003. Respondents

Advocates:

Mr.S.R.K.Prathap,ACGSC (R1,2 , 5 & 6)

Mr.N.Anilkumar, SCGSC (R 4)

Ms. Thanuja Roshan George

The OA having been heard on 7th October 2020, this Tribunal delivered the following order on 02.11.2020.

O R D E R

By P.Madhavan, Judicial Member

The applicant in this case belongs to Indian Information Service (IIS Group-B) and he is at present working as News Editor, Regional News Unit (RNU), Doordarshan Kendra, Thiruvananthapuram (DDK). He joined service on 4.8.2009 and underwent induction training for 10 months in the Indian Institute of Mass Communication, New Delhi along with 4th respondent. After the training, the applicant joined duty at Kannur in July, 2010. In the year 2012, he was transferred to Itanagar All India Radio in Arunachal Pradesh which comes under North Eastern States. Since the applicant had not completed the tenure as per the transfer policy, he challenged that order before this Tribunal by filing OA 931/2012 and an interim stay was granted and the said order was not implemented. The said OA was dismissed by the Tribunal later. Thereafter, the applicant was transferred to Guwahati in Assam as Field Exhibition Officer in the

Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity till December, 2014. After serving there, he joined back as Field Publicity Officer at Kannur. In July, 2018, the applicant was shifted to Doordarshan Kendra, Trivandrum. He joined the Trivandrum Unit in August 2018. The applicant had only completed one year 3 months at Trivandrum Station. The applicant's parents were being treated at SUT hospital, Trivandrum and his family is settled at Trivandrum. Since his parents were not well, he gave an advance representation in May 2019 before the annual general exercise of transfer. He requested for continuance in the present station as he had not completed the 5 year tenure. The said representation was forwarded to the Ministry on 21.5.2019. Without considering his representation, the applicant was transferred as Registration Supervisor, RNU, New Delhi as per Annexure A1 dated 25.11.2019. According to the applicant, the said order of transfer was made at the instance of R4 who is Joint Director (News), Trivandrum. According to him, the 4th respondents is nursing a grouse against the applicant and she had given adverse APARs for the year 2018 and 2019. But the reviewing authority - the Director of Regional News at New Delhi had specifically mentioned that the applicant is sincere, hard working and dedicated officer who could be relied upon for prompt delivery. He had also filed a representation on 7.9.2019 to the Director General for expunging the remarks made by R4 in the APARs. Another instance is also cited by the applicant for showing the enmity of R4. According to him, he had taken leave between 1st February and 10th February, 2019 after complying with all formalities for taking leave. But after a period of 9 months, a memo was issued against him seeking explanation. Another imputation alleged is even

though there exist numerous cameras installed at the corridors by the official authority of the Kendra, the 4th respondent had purposefully installed spy cameras to monitor the applicant with ulterior motives, with a video recorder kept personally in her room. It was done without authorization of the Doordarshan Kendra Head Office. There is no provision to monitor permanent employees by using camera and the applicant had requested for removal of the said camera. Close to the heels of the above incident, the applicant was transferred by Annexure A1 to New Delhi, and according to him, the said action of the respondents is with malafide which is colourable exercise of power. There is no sufficient reason to justify the transfer before the completion of the tenure. No administrative exigencies existed for the transfer. The said transfer is against the transfer policy issued by the Ministry by O.M dated 31.1.2014. Nobody was posted at Trivandrum unit in the vacancy created by the transfer. He immediately filed this Original Application and sought for an interim order to stay the operation of the impugned order.

2. On 26.11.2019, in order to circumvent the above interim order, the Additional Director General RNU had issued an order of relieving on 26.11.2019 itself and a copy of the relieving order was also sent to his personal E-mail ID, which is against the established rules and procedures. The said forwarding of e-mail was against the instructions contained in Annexure A-8 regarding official emails. Even though this Tribunal had granted an order of status quo, the said order was not implemented stating that he was already relieved. He was also not permitted to re-join duty in the station. According to him, no actual relieving has taken place and no

transfer of charge was issued as per GFR 33 which is produced as Annexure A-12. So the applicant challenges Annexure A-1 order as it is arbitrary and it is with malafide and issued with extraneous consideration and without any administrative exigencies.

3. Respondent Nos.1 to 3 have filed a detailed reply statement denying the allegations made in the Original Application. They admitted the service particulars stated in the Original Application and Annexure A-1 order issued to him. According to the respondents, the IIS officers have an all India service liability and postings and transfers etc were decided by the competent authority on the recommendations of the duly constituted Civil Service Board. The CSB had recommended transfers on the basis of functional requirements of the service and also requirements of officers in various media units of the Ministry spread all over India. The transfer of the applicant was made by the competent authority and as per the recommendations of the CSB. There is no merit in the allegations made against respondent No.4 in this case. R4 had no role in the transfer of the applicant as alleged in the application.

4. The transfer order was issued on 25.11.2019 and the applicant was relieved from the post on 26.11.2019 as per the relieving order dated 26.11.2019. The said order of relieving is produced by the respondents as Annexure R1(b). The applicant has approached the Tribunal without exhausting the remedies available to him and without even submitting a representation to the respondents. The earlier O.A., filed by the applicant was also dismissed as it had no merit. When the applicant was earlier transferred to Guwahati, his father had given a representation in 2015

requesting transfer of his son on the ground of his poor health. The applicant was given a transfer to Kannur on 13.10.2015. On 12.6.2018, the applicant's father had requested the respondent Ministry to transfer the applicant to Trivandrum or to Kannur. Accordingly, he was transferred to DDK, Trivandrum on 16.7.2018. The applicant is in the habit of sending repeated requests to retain him at Trivandrum stating the ill-health of his parents. It may not be possible for the respondents to retain him in Trivandrum or in the State of Kerala during the entire service. There was no violation of any of the policies when transfer was ordered against the applicant. The cadre controlling authority can relax any of the provisions of the policy on compelling administrative exigencies in public interest and for meeting the immediate functional requirements of the media units. So the transfer of the applicant has been done on the basis of the recommendations of the duly constituted CSB and keeping in view the compelling administrative exigencies of the RNU, New Delhi. The applicant has not disclosed all the facts before the Tribunal at the time of filing this Original Application. Even before completing the tenure in the North-East, the applicant was transferred to Kerala on the basis of repeated requests of the father of the applicant. The applicant has been working in Kerala for about 9 years in the total service of 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ year of service. So according to the respondents, there is no merit in the application filed and it is liable to be dismissed.

5. Respondent No.4 had also filed a reply statement denying the allegations made against her in the O.A. According to respondent No.4, the allegations made in the application is utter falsehood and it is done in order

to malign the respondent No.4 in the work place and also to damage reputation, career and character. The APAR of all IIS officers are done online through sparrow portal. The APAR of the applicant for 2018-19 has not been disclosed so far. Following the disclosure of the APAR to the applicant on Sep 27, 2019, he submitted his case for representation. Respondent No.4 had already given her remarks as the Reporting Authority. She had only given the facts and objective appraisal of the officer in this case. The first stage of APAR is self appraisal given by the officer and under Question No.6, there is a question which is " What are the factors hindering your performance?" The applicant has never given any hint or allegation against respondent No.4 in the said question. There is also no merit in the contention that she had sought an explanation from the applicant for the leave submitted by the applicant in February. According to her, the said explanation was sought as the Headquarters did not approve the leave and directed the respondent No.4 to seek an explanation in the matter as per letter dated 24.6.2019, which is produced as Annexure R4(c). There is also no basis for the allegation that the applicant has fixed spy cameras in the room of the applicant. The DDK Thiruvananthapuram had fixed cameras as per NRCS system which costs around Rs.20 lakh. The said cameras had become functional from 15th November 2019. Two security cameras (CCTV cameras) have been fixed in the News-cum-Edit-cum-Server room to ensure the safety and security of the high end equipments especially in the News Room system which is run with the help of casual functional staff. The new browser based system is extremely sensitive to tampering. Due warning is given to all those who are entering the room that they are under CCTV

surveillance. These types of systems are also fixed at Bengaluru, Chennai, Hyderabad DDKs as well. There had taken place incidents in which the applicant has attempted to tamper with the above cameras on 19.11.2019 and 25.11.2019. The applicant was relieved by ADG RNU on the afternoon of 26.11.2019. The said relieving order was mailed to the applicant's personal e-Mail I.D as he uses his personal Email I.D. for submitting his leave application etc. The applicant has unnecessarily dragged R4 into the question and there is no merit in the case of the applicant and there is no merit in the allegations made against respondent No.4.

6. The applicant has filed a rejoinder to the reply statement filed by R4.
7. We have heard the counsels appearing on both sides and carefully gone through the pleadings put forward in this case.
8. The main points put forward by the counsel for the applicant are that:-
 - (a) The order of transfer is against the norms or guidelines issued by the respondents.
 - (b) There is no administrative exigency for a transfer to New Delhi.
 - (c) The order of the respondents is vitiated by malafide.
 - (d) The respondents have not considered the fact that the applicant being the care giver to the dependent father should have been given exemption from transfer as per Annexure A15.

Point No.(i).

The transfer policy of the respondents is produced as Annexure A7. As per Annexure A7, the tenure of an IIS Senior Grade Group-B Officer is 5 years (vide Para E). But as per Clause (ix) under implementation, the minimum tenure is fixed as 2 years for IIS A & B Officers unless, in the

meantime, the officer is promoted, retired or sent on deputation and training. As per pleadings of the applicant, he was first appointed at Kannur in July 2010. He continued there till 2012 and was transferred to Guwahati. Thereafter, he again came back to Kerala (Kannur) on 13th October, 2015. Thereafter he was shifted to DDK, Thiruvananthapuram on 16th July 2018. The main contention raised by the counsel for the applicant is that the applicant has not completed the minimum tenure of 2 years at DDK, Trivandrum and his transfer is violative of the transfer policy for IIS officers (Annexure A7). But the counsel for respondents would contend that the applicant was working in Kerala for more than 9 years and his present posting in Kerala is nearing 5 years as on 12.10.2020. According to them, as per implementation Clause (x), the cadre controlling authority has power to relax the provisions on compelling administrative exigencies in public interest. According to them, the transfer order was made on the recommendations of duly constituted Civil Service Board (CSB) considering the functional requirements of RNI, New Delhi (vide Annexure R1(a)). IIS officers have an all India transfer liability and the applicant cannot be posted in Kerala throughout his career. The applicant is in the habit of filing representations and the respondents had considered the case of the applicant in a sympathetic manner and gave a transfer to Kannur even before completing his tenure of 2 years in the North-Eastern States. So, the transfer ordered is not in violation of the personnel policy of the respondents.

10. We have anxiously heard the arguments. On going through the pleadings, we find that on an earlier occasion also, the applicant had filed

an OA No.931/12 and obtained an interim order of stay and continued at Kannur for quite a long time and the transfer to Itanagar – a posting in North Eastern State - is avoided and ultimately the OA happened to be dismissed and he joined at Guwahati. Even while working there, he continued to give representations and the respondents gave him a transfer again to Kannur before completing the 2 year tenure in North Eastern States, which is compulsory to all. He joined at Kannur in 2015 and later shifted to DDK Trivandrum in 2018. The personnel policy Annexue A7 clearly stipulates that the competent authority can make relaxation if there exist administrative exigencies. The case of the applicant was considered by the Civil Service Board and they had approved the transfer which is impugned as A1 in this OA. We do not find any serious illegality or violation of policy guidelines to interfere with the transfer. The point is answered accordingly.

Point No.(ii):

The next point raised by the counsel for the applicant is that there was no administrative exigency existed for a transfer to RNI, New Delhi. On a perusal of recommendation of CSB Annexure R1(a), it can be seen that the Board has considered the administrative reasons as follows:

“The Ministry is in the process of strengthening RNI. In view of this, requests are being received from RNI, New Delhi for posting of Senior Grade B Officer there due to increased workload. Sri K.Anoop Sagar is posted in Kerala since 2015. Keeping in view of the functional requirement of RNI New Delhi, the officer may be transferred from DDK, Trivandrum and posted in RNI, New Delhi (on the strength of PIB New Delhi)”.

11. Annexure R1(a) clearly shows the administrative exigency in which the applicant was transferred to RNI, New Delhi. We are of the view that the respondents had satisfactorily explained the administrative exigency under which transfer was recommended. So, we find that there is no merit in this contention also.

Point No.(iii)

Another main argument put forward by the counsel is that A1 transfer order is the result of the malafide intentions entertained by respondent No.4 against the applicant. According to the counsel, the above order was issued at the instance of R4 who is not in good terms with the applicant from the very beginning of appointment. According to the counsel, R4 had earlier entered adverse remarks in the APAR of the applicant, as reporting officer, and he had given a representation to Accepting Officer for expunging the adverse remarks as Annexure A4. Further, R4 had placed spy cameras in the News Room to monitor his actions, which is not warranted. He had raised objections in this regard. It was also alleged that R4 had sought for an explanation and it also indicates the malafide intention of the 4th respondent.

12. Respondent No.4 has filed a separate reply statement denying the allegation made in the OA against her. According to her, she has nothing to do with the transfer of the applicant and all the allegations were made in order to malign her reputation among other employees. According to R4, what is written in APAR were the facts noted by her and the said APAR has not become final yet. The APARs of all officials are prepared in the SPARROW portal and her objective appraisal was given in it. There exists

.12.

an option in the form to report “what are the factors hindering your performance?”, but the applicant has not made any entries against her in it.

13. As regards her explanation sought for from the applicant, her case is that the leave applied by the applicant was not approved by the Headquarters and they had sought for getting an explanation from the applicant as per Annexure R4(e). She would also submit that cameras were fixed in DDK as per NRCS system which costs Rs.20 lakh and it became functional from 15.11.2019. Two security cameras are fixed in the News-cum-Edit-cum-Server room to ensure the safety of the high end equipments as the News Room system was run with the help of casual functional staff. This is being done at Chennai, Bengaluru and Hyderabad stations also. So there is no merit in the contention of the applicant. The counsel for the respondents would contend that the allegation of malafide can be raised only against the authority competent to transfer the applicant. R4 is only next senior officer of the applicant and she has no role to play in the transfer. The transfer order was issued on the basis of CSB recommendation. There is no allegation of malafide raised against R2&3 and hence the arguments cannot stand. The counsel for the respondents has invited our attention to the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *State of U.P. & Ors vs. Gobardhan Lal*, reported in (2004) 11 SCC 402, where it was held that “allegations of malafides must be based on concrete material and must inspire confidence of the Court”.

14. On a perusal of the records, we find that R4 had satisfactorily explained the various circumstances in which she had acted against the applicant. She had explained satisfactorily why remarks were made in the

APAR, regarding fixing of cameras in DDK TVM, and regarding the explanation sought from the applicant regarding the leave taken by him. She has successfully rebuffed the allegations of malafide intentions alleged against her. We do not find any malafides to interfere with the impugned order A1 in this case. The Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of decisions had held that courts are not expected to interfere with transfers as it is the prerogative of the authority concerned and courts should not normally interfere therewith, except when (I) transfer order is shown to be vitiated by malafides or (ii) in violation of any statutory provision or (iii) having been passed by an authority not competent to pass such an order.

Point No.(iv):

15. This OA was initially filed seeking to set aside A1 order as arbitrary and to declare that it was issued in violation of A7 norms stipulating tenure at a station and allowed the applicant to continue at the present station. On 3.3.2020, the applicant amended the OA by incorporating a challenge against the relieving order dated 26.11.2019 (Annexure A8), and to set aside A1 order on the basis of Annexure A15 O.M., dated 8.10.2018 giving exemption from exercise of transfer/rotational transfer under Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

16. Annexure A15 is an OM issued by the DoPT for protecting the interests of disabled persons coming under Right of Persons with Disabilities Act. As per Clause 3 (1) of the OM, “A government employee who is a care giver of dependent daughter/son/parents/spouse/brother/sister with specified disability, as certified by the certifying authority as a person with bench mark disability as defined under Section 2(r) of the Rights of

Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 may be exempted from the routine exercise of transfer subject to administrative constraints. The applicant has produced copies of certificates dated 20.12.2019 (A16) and Certificate of Disability of father issued by Medical Board dated 26.12.2019 (A17) to show that his father Sri Kesavan has 50% disability. The Medical Board certificate A17 shows that the patient needs support of a care giver. The counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant being the son is the care giver to his father who is laid up and his presence at the station is very much required and he is entitled to the protection of Annexure A15 O.M. The transfer order A1 is against the statutory provisions and it is liable to be set aside. The counsel for the applicant has invited our attention to the various decisions of the Tribunal in Pradeep Kumar Sreevastava & Ors vs. CBI & Ors (OA 2233/17 dated 8.2.2018); Anoop Kumar M vs. BSNL & Ors (in OA 613/17 dated 9.3.2018) etc in support of the rights of a disabled persons and the importance to follow the guidelines issued by the Government in this regard.

17. We have gone through the various contentions raised in this case. It can be seen that the exemption given to a care giver as provided under A15 was taken up by the applicant only after filing of the OA. This was raised only in the amended OA filed before us. On a perusal of the transfer order, and recommendation of CSB [R1(a)], we find that the authority had no occasion to consider the grievance of the applicant in the light of O.M., dated 8.10.2018 (A15). It seems that the disability certificates were obtained only in Dec. 2019 i.e., after filing of the OA. So this ground, raised by the applicant at the fag end of the case, cannot be considered as a subsequent

reason to set aside A1 order. The applicant ought to have given representation in this regard to the authority for consideration. So we find this point against the applicant.

18. Another contention raised by the applicant is that the relieving order A8 was issued on 26.11.2019 without properly intimating him and it was issued to circumvent the interim order dated 28.11.2019 wherein it was directed by this Tribunal that “in the interest of justice, the applicant shall not be relieved till the next hearing date.”. According to the counsel for the applicant, he received the order only on 30.11.2019 by post. On the other hand, the respondents contended that the relieving order was issued on 26.11.2019 itself and it was intimated to the applicant in his personal e-mail ID on the very same date. This fact was not stated before the Tribunal and the order happened to be issued. But the counsel for the applicant would contend that all official e-mails should have been communicated through NIC mail ID only and it is a violation of the guidelines issued. On hearing this point, we find that there is no dispute to the fact that the applicant was communicated through his personal e-mail ID on the same date and even the applicant used to send his leave applications using his personal e-mail ID. Though this is not a proper way of communication of official orders, the fact remains that the applicant was aware of the relieving order issued to him by R3. The counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that there was no head office posted at DDK TVM during that time and it was because of that, A8 was issued by the Deputy Director. On verification of the dates, we find that the OA was filed only on 27.11.2019 and the interim order not to relieve the applicant was obtained only on

28.11.2019. It is difficult to believe that the applicant was not aware of the relieving order sent through his personal e-mail. So this argument also cannot stand in the light of facts revealed in this case.

19. We have gone through the various decisions regarding the scope of interference in orders of transfer, produced by the Senior Counsel, in the case of *Shilpi Bose & Others vs. State of Bihar & Others; Union of India and Others vs. S.L.Abbas; Employees State Insurance vs. Harrison Malayalam Pvt. Ltd.; State of U.P. & others vs. Gobhardhan Lal; N.K.Singh vs. Union of India & Others* etc and since there is no need to discuss all these decisions in the facts of this case, we are not adverting to them.

20. In the light of the above discussion, we are of the view that there is nothing to interfere with the transfer order produced as A1 and the relieving order produced as A8. But before parting, we had an occasion to go through the disabilities of the father of the applicant and the duty of a son to give proper care to him. It seems that the applicant has not brought the disabilities of his father before the authorities and the role of the applicant as a care giver in this case. If the grievances stated by the applicant are true, he will be entitled to get the exemption eligible to

him as per OM issued by DoPT dated 8.10.2018 (A15). The applicant will join at the new station without delay and he is permitted to make a representation to the respondents showing that he is the caregiver of his father as per Annexure A15 and the respondents will place the matter along with all details before CSB in the coming General Transfer and consider in its proper perspective in the light of rules and guidelines issued by Government.

21. OA is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

(K.V. Eapen)
Administrative Member

(P. Madhavan)
Judicial Member

aa.

Annexures filed by the applicant:

Annexure A1: True copy of the order No.120/2019/IIS dated 25.11.2019.

Annexure A2: True copy of the representation submitted by the applicant before the 2nd respondent dated 21.5.2019.

Annexure A3: True copy of the forwarding letter bearing F.No.DDN/KASTVPM/2018-S dated 5.7.2019.

Annexure A4: True copy of the representation submitted by the applicant before the Director General, Doordarshan News, New Delhi, dated 7.9.2019.

Annexure A5: True copy of the representation submitted by the applicant before the Director General, Doordarshan News, New Delhi dated 28.10.2019.

Annexure A6: True copy of the representation submitted by the applicant before the 5th respondent dated 19.11.2019.

Annexure A7: True copy of the Office Memorandum bearing F.No.A-50013/159/2013-IIS (Pt.) dated 31.10.2014.

Annexure A8: True copy of the communication bearing No.DDN/Thiruvananthapuram/2018-S dated 26.11.2019.

Annexure A9: True copy of the Postal Receipt bearing No.RD 966648175IN dated 28.11.2019.

Annexure A10: True copy of the relevant page of the register of the postal department.

Annexure A11: True copy of the relevant extract of the Email policy of Government of India bearing F.No.2(22)/2013-EG-II issued in October, 2014.

Annexure A12: True copy of the Form GFR 33 for amendment of General Financial Rules, 1983.

Annexure A13: True copy of the communication bearing No.RNU/DDK/TVM/3/2019/833 dated 7.12.2019.

Annexure A14: True copy of the relevant page of General Financial Rules, 2017.

Annexure A15: True copy of the Office Memorandum issued by the Department of Personnel & Training, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, bearing F No.42011/3/2014-Estt(Res) dated 8.10.2018.

Annexure A16: True copy of the Certificate of disability issued by the Examining Authority bearing No.C2-13625/2019/GHT dated 20.12.2019.

Annexure A17: True copy of the Certificate of Disability issued by the Medical Board, Government Hospital, Thiruvananthapuram, Department of Health Services, government of Kerala bearing No.C2-13843/2019/GH7 dated 26.12.2019.

Annexure A18: True copy of the communication bearing No.M/o I&B's I.D. No.A-61011/1/2018-IIS/12 dated 6.1.2020.

Annexure A19: True copy of the Office Memorandum bearing No.01/02/2020-Admn dated 13.1.2020.

Annexure A20: True copy of office memorandum bearing No.9(1)/E.Coord-I/2017 dated 12.4.2017.

Annexure A21: True copy of the reply bearing F.No.I-11011/45/2019-IIS/153 dated 29.5.2020 to the Appeal filed under RTI by the applicant.

Annexure A22: True photocopy of the photograph of the applicant's father P.Kesavan Namboothiri, taken on 19.8.2020.

Annexues filed by the respondents:

Annexure R1 (a): True copy of the recommendations of Civil Service Board.

Annexure R1(b): True copy of order No.DDN/KAS/TVPM/2018-S dated 26.11.2019 of Ministry of Information & Broadcasting.

Annexure R1(c): True copy of order No.73/2012-IIS dated 9.10.2012 issued by Ministry of Information & Broadcasting.

Annexure R1(d): True copy of order in OA 931/2012 dated 28.1.2014 of this Tribunal.

Annexure R1(e): True copy of Relieving order No.K.17/11/2013/1107 dated 14.2.2014.

Annexure R1(f) : True copy of Representations dated 5.3.2014 and 17.7.2014.

Annexure R1(g): True copy of communication No.PF/2626/ISS/618 dated 4.8.2014.

Annexure R1(h): True copy of representations along with medical certificates.

Annexure R1(i): True copy of order No.81/2014-IIS dated 12.09.2014 issued by the Ministry.

Annexure R1(j): True copy of representation received from his mother dated 28.8.2014.

Annexure R1(k): True copy of representation dated 14.9.2015.

Annexure R1(l): True copy of transfer order No.113/2015-IIS issued by the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting dated 13.10.2015.

Annexure R1(m): True copy of letter dated 12.6.2018.

Annexure R1(n): True copy of order dated 16.7.2018.

Annexure R1(o): True copy of appointment letter No.A-120125/4/2007-IIS (Pt)/510 dated 8.7.2009.

Annexure R1(p): True copy of the judgment in Mrs.Shilpi Bose and Others vs. State of Bihar and others of the Apex Court.

Annexure R1(q): True copy of the judgment in State of U.P. and Ors. Vs. Gobardhan Lal, AIR 2004 SC 2165 and others of the Apex Court.

Annexure R1 (r): True copy of order dated 31.7.2018.

Annexure R1(s): True copy of OM F.No.A-10011/16/2015-PPC (Vol.II) dated 7.11.2019 issued by the Director (Pers.), Prasar Bharathi Secretariat.

Annexure R1(t): True copy of order No.BNG/ADG(SZ)/Misc/2019 dated 5.12.2019 issued by Addl. Director General (P), South Zone.

Annexure R1 (u): True copy of the screen shot of mails sent by the applicant through his rediffmail.com

Annexure R1(v): True copy of the representation dated 5.12.2019 submitted to the 5th respondent.

Annexure R1(w): True copy of the representation dated 6.12.2019 submitted before the 5th respondent.

Annexure R4 (A): True copy of the Leave Application submitted by the Applicant dated 11.2.2019.

Annexure R4 (B): True copy of the relevant page of Dispatch Register (entry number 751) showing that the leave Letter was dispatched on 13.2.2019 to DD News Headquarters for approval.

Annexure R4 (C): True copy of the letter from Headquarters dated 24.6.2019.

Annexure R4 (D): True copy of the Note given by the RNU Head to the Head of Engineering dated 23.9.2019.

Annexure R4 (E): True copy of the relevant portion of the mail sent by the Head of Engineering to the concerned authorities dated 20.11.2019.

Annexure R4 (F): True copy of the Letters given by several Officers of the Engineering Wing.

Annexure R4 (G): True copy of the Relieving order issued by ADG (RNU) dated 26.11.2019.

Annexure R4 (H): True copy of the screenshot of the mail page showing that the Relieving Order was mailed to the Applicant's personal mail id - anoopsagark@rediffmail.com at 17.14 hours on Nov 26, 2019.

Annexure R4 (I): True copy of the Screenshot of the mail page showing that a Medical leave application was sent by the Applicant from anoopsagark@rediffmail.com at 13.02 hrs on Nov 26, 2019 to this Office.

Annexure R4 (J): True copy of the mail dated 28.11.2019 in which Applicant wrongly claims that the Honourable CAT had given a stay on the operation of the transfer Order of the Ministry.

Annexure R4 (K): True copy of the screenshot of the mail page showing that the communication - Annexure R4 (J) was received from the Applicant at 11.34 hrs on 28.11.2019 from the mail id, anoopsagark@rediffmail.com

Annexure R4 (L): True copy of the postal slip showing that the Relieving Order was sent at 9.43 am on 27.11.2019 to the Applicant's Home address.