

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI.

DATE OF DECISION

13/9/92

FOR THE APPLICANT

Sh. G.D. Gupta
Sh. D.R. Gupta
Sh. K.L. Bhatia
with Sh. O.P. Khosha

FOR THE RESPONDENTS

Sh. M.L. Verma
Sh. P.P. Khurana
and Sh. Jag Singh

1. D.A. No. 1485/91 D.F. Gehalan & Others -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
2. D.A. No. 1745/91 S.N. Mehta & Ors. -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
3. D.A. No. 1458/91 J.K. Vohra -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
4. D.A. No. 1960/91 B.S. Patwal -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
5. D.A. No. 1970/91 Narayan Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
6. D.A. No. 2006/91 Chander Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
7. D.A. No. 2008/91 Parkash Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
8. D.A. No. 1896/91 Ram Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
9. D.A. No. 2108/91 Khyat-Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I.
10. D.A. No. 2400/91 Bhaskar -do-
V/s U.O.I.
11. D.A. No. 1599/91 Ganga Ram -do-
V/s U.O.I.
12. D.A. No. 1642/91 Ram Khilari -do-
V/s U.O.I.
13. D.A. No. 1538/91 Attar Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I. & Ors.
14. D.A. No. 1894/91 Bhagat Singh -do-
V/s U.O.I.

CORAM

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ram Pal Singh, Vice Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Member Sh. I.P. Gupta, Member(A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
- ✓ 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? Yes.

17

J U D G E M E N T

Delivered by Hon'ble Shri I.P. Gupta, Member (A) 7

and no...
scale of the evaluation of their work
and conduct based on the ACRs as was

discussed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

The issues involved in the aforesaid O.As.

are common and, therefore, the O.As. are being dealt

with together. The applicants in O.As. were initially

recruited as daily wages/Group 'Q' employees through

the agency of local Employment Exchange. They worked

in that capacity for some time whereafter they were

promoted as ad hoc LDCs, on the basis of their

qualifications and experience. They have been working

as ad hoc LDCs. from periods ranging between 1981 and

1989, with occasional breaks, which the applicants have termed

as "technical breaks". Several of them have passed

the typing test conducted by the Staff Selection

Commission and some others have not. They possess

the minimum educational qualifications prescribed

for the post of LDC. They have also earned annual

increments in the LDC grade. None of them have been

regularised yet.

2. The contentions of the Learned Counsels for

the applicants were

(1) The case of similarly situated LDCs

was dealt with in O.A. Nos. 668, 914,

985, and 1018 of 1988 whose decision

was given by the Principal Bench of

12th April 1991. The respondents

were directed to take immediate steps to

regularise the services of the applicants

as LDC in consultation with the Staff

Selection Commission. While doing so,

they shall, if necessary, relax the

18

Upper age limit for appointment as LDC.

Their regularisation should be on the

basis of the evaluation of their work

and conduct based on the ACRs as was

directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

Dr. A.K. Jain's case. Till the applicants

were so regularised, they should not be

reverted to their substantive posts in

Group B. The applicants should be entitled

to the protection of pay and allowances in-

cluding increments in the posts of LDC and

other benefits as are admissible to a regular

employee.

(ii) The directions of Department of Personnel &

Training in their O.M. dated 31.5.1991 included

instructions that in cancellation of previous

instructions, ad hoc arrangements in the

grade of LDCs should be discontinued, except

in those situations where such appointments

have to be continued on orders of Courts of Law/

CAT. These instructions were issued because

experience had shown that continuation of ad hoc

arrangements of long periods resulted in

administrative problems particularly when on the

availability of regular candidates, attempts

were made by the employees concerned who had

continued to officiate on ad hoc basis for long

periods to frustrate any move for their replace-

ment by regular LDCs. This had often resulted

in an embarrassing situation for the Government.

Learned Counsel for the applicants have termed

these instructions as arbitrary and unlawful

especially in view of the judgement of CAT dated

12.4.1991 referred to above.

(iii) Vacancies existed to accommodate the

applicants and the nominees of the SSC

were not available to necessitate their

reversion and the reversion of the applicants

was totally unjustified.

(iv) The Learned Counsel quoted the following

from the judgement of the Principal Bench

in O.A. No. 668/88 etc. decided on 12.4.1991:-

In Jacob M. Puthuparambil & Others
Vs. Kerala Water Authority & Others,

1990(4) SC 27, the Supreme Court

had considered a similar issue relating

to the regularisation of persons who

had been appointed on ad hoc basis for

several years. The Supreme Court

had directed the respondents to regulari-

se the services of such employees who have

put in continuous service of not less

than one year, as a separate block in

consultation with the Kerala Public Service

Commission. In doing so, the Kerala

Public Service Commission has been

directed to take the age factor as waived.

In arriving at this conclusion, the

Supreme Court relied upon its earlier

decision in Smt. P.K. Narayani & Others

Vs State of Kerala & Others, 1984 Suppl.

SCC 212 and in Dr. A.K. Jain & Others

Vs. Union of India & Others, 1987 SCC 497."

(v) The recruitment rules regarding recruitment

of LDCs in the Central Government offices provided

inter alia, recruitment to the LDC grade

of the service shall be made in the following

manner :-

(a) Five percent of the vacancies

may be filled on the basis of

qualifying examinations held

for this purpose by the Staff

Selection Commission; and

the balance may be filled provisionally on an regular basis

in such manner as may be prescribed by the Central

Government. The Learned Counsel further contended that

the recruitment rules provided for a relaxation in the

20

(a)(ii) Five percent of the vacancies may be filled on the basis of seniority, subject to the rejection of the unfit, from amongst those Group 'D' employees who are within the range of seniority prescribed by the Department of Personnel & Training and are educationally qualified for appointment as Lower Division Clerk, i.e., who have passed the Matriculation or an equivalent examination of a recognised Board of University.

Provided that if sufficient number of persons do not become available the vacancies shall be filled in manner prescribed in clause (b).

Provided further that if more of such employees than the number of vacancies available under this clause qualify at the said examination, such excess employees shall be considered for filling the vacancies arising in the subsequent years so that the employees qualifying at an earlier examination are considered before those who qualify at a later examination.

(b) Ninety percent of the vacancies of such higher percentage as may be determined by the Central Government in the Department of Personnel & Training in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension, in accordance with the proviso to Clause (a) shall be filled by direct recruitment on the basis of Competitive Examination held for the purpose by the Staff Selection Commission.

Provided that to the extent a sufficient number of qualified candidates of the competitive examinations referred to in clauses (a) and (b) are not available for appointment on the results of such examinations, the vacancies may be filled provisionally or on regular basis. In such manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government in the Department of Personnel and Training in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension.

Therefore, it would be seen that if sufficient number of qualified candidates of the competitive examinations either against 5 per cent quota to be filled on the basis of qualifying examination conducted by SSC or against 90 per cent direct recruitment quota were not available for appointment on the result of such examination the vacancies may be filled provisionally or on regular basis in such manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government. The Learned Counsel further contended that the recruitment rules provided for a relaxation clause

which reads as below :-

"Where the cadre authority is of opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do, it may, by order, for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation with the Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms in the Cabinet Secretariat relax any of these rules with respect to any class or category of persons or posts".

3. The applicants have continued against the posts of

LDCs on ad hoc basis on the strength of interim order issued in various cases from time to time. However, the applicant(s) in O.A. No. 2006/91 (Chander Singh Negi) was reverted with effect from 3.9.1991.

4. The applicants have sought for the relief that the

respondents should be directed to extend the benefit of the judgement in O.A. No. 688/88 etc. decided on 12.4.1991 to the applicants who are similarly situated by regularising their services as LDC in terms of the directions given in the aforesaid judgement by quashing reversion of the applicants.

5. The Learned Counsel for the respondents contended

that -

- (i) the applicants have been/are regular employees in Group D and were promoted as LDC on purely ad hoc and short-term basis. The orders for reversion were issued but in several cases they could not be served as the applicants proceeded on leave when they got the knowledge of this. The orders were served through registered AD post.
- (ii) Ad hoc promotion of a person does not create any vested right to continue in the post and he may be reverted. It was indicated in the promotion orders that he would have no right for regularisation. Possession of the requisite educational qualification and passing of the type writing test are the requirement for holding the post of LDC. This does not confer any right of holding the post on regular basis.

as regular promotion can only be made as per the provisions of CSCS Rules, 1962.

(iii) The judgement in question of the Tribunal dated 12.4.1991 are not of general nature and are applicable to the Ministry of Urban Development who were the respondents. The cases of the applicants who are in the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Fertilisers and Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals, Planning Commission and Department of Company Affairs are on a different footing and cannot be equated with the cases in the aforesaid O.As. whose judgement was given on 12.4.1991.

(iv) The applicants had to be reverted in keeping with the instructions of the Department of Personnel dated 31st May 1991 where it was clearly directed that ad hoc arrangements in the grade of LDC should be discontinued except in those situations where such appointments had to be continued on orders of Courts of Law/CAT.

Let us analyse the facts and issues involved in the aforesaid cases. It is well established that ad hoc appointments dehors the rules do not establish any right. Further, no regularisation in service can be allowed contrary to statutory rules. It cannot be that in contravention of the statutory rules, ad hoc appointment is made and after some time that appointment is regularised. The statutory rules for recruitment cannot be allowed to be circumvented in this manner. It is only when there are no statutory rules for recruitment and the vacancies exist that ad hoc employees or daily wages, employed for sufficient length of time, may be entitled to be regularised. If the statutory rules contain a provision for relaxation, then possibly powers can be exercised for relaxation of the rules in favour of those employees who have rendered services for a number of years [Vipin Kumar & Others v/s Delhi Development Authority (1991 CSJ (Vol.I) p.444)].

23
7. The judgement in the case of Jacob M.

Puthuparambilly & Others V/s Kerala Water Authority &

Others, In Smt. P.K. Narayani & Others v/s State of

Kerala & Others and in Dr. A.K. Jain & Others v/s

Union of India and Others (Supra) have also to be kept

in view.

8. Keeping in view the judicial pronouncement and the decision taken by the Tribunal in O.A. No.668/88 etc.

decided on 12.4.1991, the applications are disposed of

with the following orders and directions -

Subject to the conditions that nominees of

SSC are not waiting for regular appointments

either under 5 per cent quota to be filled

by qualifying examinations conducted by SSC

under 90 per cent quota for direct recruitment

by the SSC.

(i) Such of the applicants as have put in continuous service of not less than one year and are

qualified educationally and

also in the typing test conduc-

ted by the SSC should be consi-

dered for regularisation as LDCs

in consultation with the Staff Selection Commission. While doing

so, the respondents shall, if necessary, relax the upper age

limit for appointment as LDCs.

Their regularisation should be

on the basis of the evaluation

of their work and conduct based

on the ACRs, as was directed

by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

Dr. A.K. Jain's case.

(ii) Such of the applicants as have not qualified in the typing test conducted by SSC should be allowed to take the ^{full} prescribed test for filling the post ^{of LDC} on regular basis against 5 per cent quota to be

24

filled by qualified examination or against 90 per cent quota for direct recruitment, according to rules by relaxation of age bar to the extent of ad hoc service.

(iii) The applicant(s) as have been reverted should be taken back on ad hoc basis, subject to available vacancy and subject to any ad hoc employee (not passed in typing test) still serving with lesser experience with no back wages.

(iv) None of the applicants who are on ad hoc basis should be reverted by replacement by other ad hoc employee. They can be reverted only when regular nominees of SSC are available. It may be reiterated that against regular nominees none of the applicants will have any claim to continue unless they have been regularised meanwhile in the manner indicated above.

The interlocutory orders including the interim directions would merge into this order.

10. With the above directions, the aforesaid O.As. are disposed of with no orders as to costs.

I.P. Gupta
Member (A) 13/8/92

Ram Pal Singh
Vice-Chairman(J)

True Copy

Attested

[Signature]

SINGH) 13/8/92

Court Officer

Central Administrative Tribunal
P.O. Box 100, Faridkot House
New Delhi 110 001