

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/020/00426/2015**

HYDERABAD, this the 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2021

**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member**

**Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**



B.Appa Rao S/o Demudu,  
Aged 44 years, Occ : District Youth Co-ordinator,  
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Visakhapatnam,  
R/o H.No.21-8, Brahmin Street, P.S.Peta,  
Chodavaram (Mandal),  
Visakhapatnam District.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. B. Pavan Kumar)

Vs.

- 1.Union of India, Rep by its Secretary,  
Youth Affairs & Sports, Sastri Bhavan,  
C-Wing, New Delhi.
- 2.Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan,  
Rep by its Director General, II Floor,  
Core-IV, Scope Minar, Laxmi Nagar  
District Centre, Vikas Marg, Delhi 110 092.
- 3.The Zonal Director, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan,  
H.No.16-2-738/4/5/4, Plot No.4, SBH Colony,  
Asmangadh, Malakpet, Hyderabad ó 500 036.
- 4.The Pay & Accounts Officer & Zonal Director,  
Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan, PAO No.942,  
42<sup>nd</sup> Cross, Rajaji Nagar, 3<sup>rd</sup> Block, Bangalore-5600010.
- 5.The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by its Secretary,  
School Education Department, Secretariat of A.P.,  
at Hyderabad ó 500 022.
- 6.The District Educational Officer, Visakhapatnam District.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC)

---

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr.B.V.Sudhakar, Administrative Member)**

**Through Video Conferencing:**



2. The O.A. is filed in regard to extension of deputation of the applicant in the respondent's organization.

3. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant while working as Secondary Grade Teacher in the A.P. State Government, responded to the notification dated 01.11.2008 of the respondents, wherein it was proposed to fill up the post of District Youth Coordinator at Visakhapatnam. The applicant was selected by following due selection procedure and the applicant joined on 29.3.2010 as District Youth Coordinator. The respondents extended the deputation period of the applicant on annual basis and finally on 28.3.2015, they have issued notice to relieve him. Aggrieved over the same, the O.A. is filed.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that he has represented on 15.3.2015 and before his representation was disposed of, Respondent No.3 is trying to relieve him. The applicant is eligible to work as District Youth Coordinator and that his parent department has given 'No Objection Certificate' for his continuation on deputation.

5. The respondents submitted in their reply that there are no provisions in the rules to allow extension of deputation beyond 5 years. The applicant was allowed to work on deputation for 5 years from 2010 to 2015 and had to be relieved after giving due notice.

6. Heard Dr. A Raghu Kumar representing Sri B. Pavan Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs. K. Rajitha, learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, and perused the pleadings on record.



7(I) The applicant on being selected against notification issued by the respondents on 01.11.2008, was deputed to work as District Youth Coordinator in Nehru Yuva Kendra from 29.3.2010. The selection was based on deputation and the respondents extended the deputation year after year. The maximum period for deputation as provided vide DOPT OM dated 17.6.2010 is five years. Keeping this instruction of the DOPT in view, the respondents extended the deputation period of the applicant on an annual basis for maximum five years. The five year period ended on 28.3.2015. Therefore, a notice was issued to the applicant on 25.11.2014 that he would be relieved by 28.3.2015. The applicant did make a representation on 15.3.2015. But in view of the DOPT instructions cited, the applicant had necessarily to be relieved.

(II) Another contention of the applicant is that he has prayed for absorption in the respondent's organization. In the notification dated 1.11.2008, there is no provision for absorption of a deputationist. From the conditions of deputation, it is clear that there is no absorption. Hence, the prayer of the applicant for absorption cannot be entertained.

(III) The respondents did contend that the applicant is from State Government and, therefore, he has no jurisdiction to approach this Tribunal. We do not agree with this contention because the applicant,

while working on deputation basis in the respondent's organization has approached this Tribunal, to ventilate his grievance about deputation and, therefore, he is eligible to appear before this Tribunal as a deputationist. Nevertheless, in respect of continuation of his deputation, the relief sought cannot be granted since the rules are not in his favour.



In view of the above circumstances, we do not find any merit in the O.A. Hence, it is dismissed with no order as to costs.

**(B.V.SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

/pv/