

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

(A)

O.A.No. 2572/91

Date of decision: July 15, 1992.

Suraj Bhan

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

O.A.No. 2573/91

Dinesh Silmania

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

O.A.No. 555/92

P. Subramanium & Anr.

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

O.A.No. 556/92

Ram Sewak

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

...Respondents

O.A.No. 557/92

Virender Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

...Respondents

O.A.No. 558/92

Manjit Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

contd...

O.A.No. 620/92

Phool Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 629/92

Gajraj Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 682/92

N. Rehman

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ans. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 683/92

Prem Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ans. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 691/92

Brahm Prakash & 2 others ...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 711/92

Kagdish Singh & Another ...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 1216/91

Khushwant Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

Over

contd...3.

O.A.No. 1452/91

Santosh Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 1601/92

B.R. Reddy

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 1662/91

B.C. Reddiech

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Agr. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 1966/91

Rajbir Singh & Others

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 2471/91

Ram Kumar Swami

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 49/92.

Dayender Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr. ... Respondents

O.A.No. 768/92

Inder Singh & Others

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

Contd....4.

O.A. No. 1087/91.

Ram Stringar & Others ... Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr. ... Respondents

O.A. No. 1421/91.

Nafe Singh ... Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Anr. ... Respondents

Herbato need avsd case for ORAMS

THE HON'BLE MR. P.K. KARTHA, VICE-CHAIRMAN(J).  
THE HON'BLE MR. B.N. DHUNDIYAL, MEMBER(A).

Applicants through Shri R.L.  
Sethi, Counsel.

Respondents through Ms. Geeta Luthra,  
Counsel; and S/Shri Anoop Bagai, Counsel;  
Pawan Behl, Counsel; O.N. Trisal, Counsel;  
M.C. Gary, Counsel; B.R. Prashar, Counsel.

#### JUDGMENT (ORAL)

( Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman(J) )

As common questions of law and fact

arise for consideration in this batch of cases,

they were heard together and are being disposed of

by this common judgment.

2. The applicants belong to the Central Police

Contd...5.

96

Organisations (CPOs) consisting of C.R.P.F., B.S.P., I.T.B.P., and C.I.S.P. They were deputed to the Delhi Police on various dates and the deputation has been extended from time to time. The respondents have permanently absorbed about 400 such persons but they have decided to repatriate about 100 persons to their parent departments. The applicants before us belong to the category of those who have been ordered to be repatriated to their parent departments. By virtue of the interim orders passed by the Tribunal, they are, however, continuing with the Delhi Police in their present posts.

3. The applicants belong to the category of Constables/Head Constables. Rule 9 of the Delhi Police (Appointment and Recruitment) Rules, 1980 prescribes matric/higher secondary, 10th or 10+2 as the minimum educational standard for the purpose of recruitment/appointment of Police constables.

Rule 17 of the Delhi Police (General Conditions of Service) Rules, 1980 provides, inter alia, that the Commissioner of Police, Delhi may sanction permanent absorption in Delhi Police of upper and lower

constables transferred from other States/Union Territories.

Contd...6.

**Territories and Central Police Organisations, with  
their consent and with the concurrence of the head  
of the Police force of the State/Union Territory  
or the Central Police Organisations etc.**

4. The case of the applicants is that the respondents did not consider their case for absorption in the Delhi Police in accordance with the policy decision contained in their letter dated 11-7-1990 dealing with the permanent absorption of Constables from CPOs to Delhi Police. According to the said decision, all Constables of the CPOs who have completed two years of deputation period and who are below 40 years of age and possess matric or above educational qualification are eligible for absorption. In such cases, the persons concerned are to be heard in person and their suitability should be assessed after scrutinising their service records.

5. The grievance of the applicants is that the policy decision was not implemented fairly and that this had resulted in arbitrariness and discrimination. As against this, the learned counsel for the respondents argued that the decision taken

Contd...7.

by the respondents to absorb or not to absorb the deputationists was on the basis of the records available with them and that there was no arbitrariness or discrimination in the action taken by them.

6. According to the admitted facts of the case, those who have passed matriculation examination and above and are/eligible are to be considered for absorption in accordance with Rule

17 mentioned above as also the policy decision contained in the letter dated 11-7-1990. Another Bench of this Tribunal has disposed of a batch of applications by judgment dated 2-6-1992 in O.A.No.525/92

(Mohd. Safi & Ors. Vs. Delhi Administration, & Ors.)

and connected matters. In the operative part of the

judgment, the Tribunal has upheld the decision of

the respondents to repatriate such of those who did

not possess the matriculation or equivalent qualification

to their parent departments. At the same time, the

Tribunal directed the respondents in-so-far as

the seven of the applicants before the Tribunal were

concerned to file representations, if any, within 2

weeks and produce the material in support of their

case that they possess the requisite educational

qualification. In that event, the respondents were

directed to examine their cases for absorption and

if they are found eligible and fit for absorption,

a decision in that behalf should be taken within

four weeks after the receipt of the representations.

Further that The Tribunal/directed/until such representations

were decided, the seven applicants shall not be

repatriated to their parent departments. Barring

the case of seven applicants, the applications filed

by the others were dismissed and the interim orders

were vacated in their cases.

7. The applicants before us are also similarly

situated. After hearing both sides, we are of the

opinion that similar directions should be issued to

the respondents in this batch of applications

before us. Accordingly, we uphold the decision of

the respondents to repatriate such of those who do

not possess the matriculation or equivalent or higher

qualification or whose absorption does not have the

consent of their parent departments. Subject to

what is stated above, the applications before us

are disposed of with the following orders and

directions :-

(1) The applicants may send representations

Contd...9.

to the respondents within three weeks from the date of receipt of this Order together with the documents which may substantiate their claim that they possess matriculation or equivalent or higher qualification;

(ii) In case the applicants make such a representation, the respondents shall consider the same and if the applicants possess the requisite qualifications prescribed under the Rules and if they are otherwise found eligible in all respects for absorption as on the date of the passing of the impugned order of repatriation to their parent departments, the respondents shall pass appropriate orders within four weeks after the receipt of the representations;

(iii) Till appropriate orders are passed on such representations, the respondents are restrained from repatriating the applicants to their parent departments. The interim orders already passed will continue till then.

There will be no order as to costs.

Let a copy of this Order be placed in all the files and a copy be given to both parties immediately.

(PURAN CHAND)

Court Officer

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principals Office, 1st Floor  
Caperatus Marg, New Delhi

(B.N. DHOONDIYAL)  
MEMBER (A)

(P.K. KARTHA)  
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

PKK  
15071992.

Original placed in  
Case No 252/91  
C.A. 252/91  
Copy

True Copy  
16/7/92