



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.42 of 2020

Orders reserved on : 19.08.2021
Orders pronounced on : 16.09.2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Bishnoi, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J)

Shri Kapil Gurjar, aged 26 years
S/o Shri Gangashyam
VPO. Parmadra, Teh. Deeg,
Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
Pin Code : 321203

(Applicant for Group-B Sub-Inspector
Railway Protection Force)

... Applicants

(through Advocate Shri Arun Bhardwaj, learned Sr. Counsel
assisted by Shri Ravi Kumar and Ms. Gauraan)

Versus

1. Ministry of Railways,
Through :
The Chairman (Railway Board)
256-A, Raisina Road,
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.

2. The Chairman,
Central Recruitment Committee (SI),
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.

... Respondents

(through Advocate Shri Shailendra Tiwary)

ORDER**Hon'ble Mr. R. N. Singh, Member (J):**

The applicant has filed the present Original Application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as 'the AT Act of 1985) to challenge the order dated 8.7.2019 (Annexure A-9) vide which he has been declared 'unfit' for appointment to the post of Sub-Inspector (Executive) in the Railway Protection Force (hereinafter referred to as 'the RPF') under the respondent No.1 on medical grounds.

2. The applicant has prayed for the following reliefs:-

- “(i) Setting aside & quashing the orders dated 08.07.2019 of R – 1 as unreasonable, arbitrary and violative of guaranteed fundamental rights under Article 14 of Constitution.
- (ii) Directing the respondent no. 1 & 2 to appoint the Applicant to the post of Sub-Inspector (Executive), RPF with protection of seniority and consequential benefits.
- (iii) Allow summary disposal of the O.A. in accordance with the Judgment of this Hon'ble Tribunal dated 02.09.2019 in O.A. 3209 of 2018 in matter of *Abhishek Yadav vs Staff Selection Commission and Anr.* read with the Judgment of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in W.P(C) 3196 of 2012 in matter of *Ms. Sreeja K. Vs Union of India.*
- (iv) Pass such other orders as necessary in interest of justice.”



3. The brief facts leading to the present Application are that the respondents have notified the vacancies for recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspector in RPF and Railway Protection Special Force in level 6 of 7th CPC Pay Matrix with initial pay of Rs.35400/- plus other allowances vide Employment Notice No.SI/RPF – 02/2018 (Annexure A-2) and in response to such notification, the applicant has applied under OBC category. The applicant participated in the relevant written test and on being qualified thereon was called for physical measurement and efficiency test and in such test also he qualified. The applicant was empanelled for the post under reference vide notice (Annexure A-4) and his name appeared at serial No.62 of such notice. However, the applicant has been declared 'unfit' for such appointment on the ground 'Unfit in Bee-one' vide impugned order dated 8.7.2019. It has been asserted by the applicant that the applicant has been declared medically unfit for the post on the ground of 'having under gone LASIK surgery for vision correction'. The applicant's appeal against such impugned order is also stated to have been rejected. Therefore, the present OA.

4. Pursuant to notice from this Tribunal, the respondents have filed the reply/short reply on 9.12.2020



to oppose the Original Application on the ground of lack of jurisdiction of this Tribunal and also otherwise. The applicant has also filed rejoinder and in such rejoinder, he has annexed Judgment dated 19.3.2019 of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in **Sarbeswar Behera and Ors. vs. Union of India and others** (Civil Appeal No.11705 of 2017) (Annexure A/1), a copy of order/judgment of this Tribunal in OA 2065/2014, titled **Shri Ajay Singh vs. Union of India and others**, (Annexure A/12) and Judgment dated 5.2.2019 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1474/2019, titled **Union of India and others vs. Sri Harananda and others**.

5. In such reply the respondents have made an assertion that the applicant has suppressed the relevant facts which go to the root of the matter and, therefore, the present OA deserves outright dismissal. However, it is not disputed that the applicant has applied for the post of Sub Inspector in RPF and finally he could not qualify in the medical examination for the said post due to vision problem and having undergone LASIK surgery. The respondents have taken a preliminary objection that in view of the provisions of Section 2 of the AT Act of 1985, this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction towards any member of the naval, military or air forces or of any other armed forces of



the Union and accordingly, the present OA deserves dismissal. It is further contended by the respondents that as per Section 3 of the Railway Protection Act, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as 'RPF Act of 1957'), RPF is an armed Force of the Union constituted and maintained by the Central Government and also that this Tribunal in catena of judgments, including in OA 2065/2014, titled ***Ajay Kumar vs. Union of India and others***, has dismissed the OA on the ground of lack of jurisdiction.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties, the matter was reserved for orders vide Order dated 22.1.2021. However, during the course of preparing the Order/Judgment, it has been noticed that in the aforesaid Employment Notice No. 02/2018 (Annexure A-2) under para 16 (f), it is provided as under:-

“(f) Any legal issues arising out of this Employment Notice shall fall within the legal jurisdiction of respective Central Administrative Tribunals under which the CRC is located.”

In view of such provision in the relevant Employment notice, the matter was posted for 'For Being Spoken To' on 18.2.2021 vide Order dated 11.2.2021. On 18.2.2021, the learned counsel for the respondents has submitted under instructions that inadvertently it has been provided in the relevant Employment notice that this Tribunal will be having the jurisdiction in the matter and he has sought



and was granted time to enable the respondents to file an additional affidavit. Pursuant to such liberty, the respondents have filed an additional affidavit along with the letter/order dated 8.3.2021 (Annexure –AA/1) and in the said additional affidavit also, the respondents have contended that this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction and to support their contentions, they have referred to the provisions of Section 3 of the RPF Act of 1957 and the Order/Judgment dated 6.1.2020 of Jabalpur Bench of this Tribunal in OA 200/01077 of 2019, titled **Swati Yadav vs. UOI and others**. They have also relied upon the provisions of Section 2 (a) of the AT Act of 1985 and also on the judgment of coordinate Bench of this Tribunal at Calcutta in the case of **Bhola Nath Sen vs. Union of India and others**, reported in (1991) 16 ATC 125, to contend that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction in view of the provisions of Section 2 (1) of the AT Act of 1985 over the RPF personnel. With regard to para 16 (f) of the aforesaid Employment Notification No.SI/RPF – 02/2018, it has been contended by the respondents that the same was inadvertently provided and the provisions of such para in the relevant Employment Notice could not overrule the statutory provisions of AT Act of 1985 to the extent



that for recruitment to the post under RPF, a uniform armed Force of the Union, the Tribunal lacks jurisdiction.

7. The applicant has filed written submissions and has also filed certain documents to reiterate that in the Advertisement No.01/2018 dated 1.6.2018, para 16 (f) of which is identical to that in the aforesaid Employment Notice No.02/2018 and as such this Tribunal is having the jurisdiction on the issue involved in the present OA.

8. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties and we have also perused the pleadings on record.

9. Shri Bhardwaj, learned senior counsel appearing for the applicant, has argued that the aforesaid Employment Notices, i.e., No.SI/RPF – 02/2018 and 01/2018 both have rightly provided that ‘Any legal issues arising out of this Employment Notice shall fall within the legal jurisdiction of respective Central Administrative Tribunals under which the CRC is located.’ He has further submitted that internal communication dated 8.3.2021 shall not make any difference in view of the fact that the statutory provision as well as the relevant Railways Rules clearly indicate that the issue involved in the present OA, i.e., the matter regarding recruitment to a post under RPF shall be amenable to the jurisdiction of this Tribunal. To strengthen this argument, learned senior counsel



appearing for the applicant has referred to Section (2) (c) of the RPF Act of 1957. He has also argued that the Full Bench of this Tribunal in the matter of **Satyendra Narayan Pandey vs. Union of India and others**, reported on 1993 SCC OnLine CAT 48, has held the OA filed by an Assistant Security Officer working in the RPF is not amenable and the said Judgment was followed in all later cases. However, those judgments, including the judgments being referred to and relied upon on behalf of the respondents are of no use qua the objection of the respondents in as much as the said judgments are in respect of the person holding the post under the RPF, i.e., member of the RPF, whereas in the present case, the applicant is not holding any post under the RPF. He has argued that RPF is a civil service under the Union of India and in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sri Harananda** (supra), this Tribunal is having the jurisdiction on the issue in hand. He has made further submissions to strengthen his argument and in support of his argument, he emphasised the following that this Tribunal is having jurisdiction:-

- (i) 'Railway Protection Force (RPF)' service is included by the UPSC in its Civil Service Examination and selections to RPF are made by UPSC Civil Services Examination;



- (ii) Selections to 'Railway Protection Force (RPF)' are not made through the other separate 'CAPF Exam (Central Armed Police Forces Exam) conducted by UPSC;
- (iii) Under the O.M. dated 14.12.2010 of UoI, defining service cadres, RPF is placed at Sl. 15 in List of 'Non-Technical' Services while all armed forces fall under 'Other Services';
- (iv) u/s 8 of RPF Act 1957, RPF works under the general supervision of General Manager of Railways;
- (v) u/s 9 of the RPF Act 1957, RPF members are protected under Art.311 of Constitution of colouring it as civil service;
- (vi) u/s 10 of the RPF Act 1957, RPF members are 'deemed to be railway serants for all purposes.'
- (vii) Sec. 2(34) of Railways Act defines 'Railway Servants' and expressly includes members of the Railway Protection Force (clause inserted by amendment to RPF Act in 2003);
- (viii) Sec. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 of the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Act confers upon RPF members powers under CrPC of summon, arrest, search, seizure, investigation. Etc. under the general supervision of General Manager of Railways under Ministry of Railways;
- (ix) RPF members can be transferred to any other Railway department, or from RPF to zonal Railway as defined under Schedule II, Cl. 5, of administrative powers under RPF Rules 1987;
- (x) Sec. 41.1 of the RPF rules 1987 expressly restricts and prohibits deployment of RPF from carrying out



any Law & Order functions unlike CISF, ITBP, BSF etc. and

- (xi) RPF is under Ministry of Railways while all armed forces are under Ministry of Home Affairs.

He has further argued that though the RPF is an armed Force of the Union of India, however, the RPF is 'is also a civil service as per the statutory provisions and determination by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in 'Sri Harananda' case. Moreover, the RPF is afforded protection under Article 311 of Constitution u/s 9 of the RPF Act, 1957 which unambiguously shows that RPF is a civil service of Union unlike other Central Armed Police Forces (CAPF). Furthermore, the applicant being a non-member of Railway Protection Force (RPF) praying recruitment to a civil post under RPF is amenable to jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal under Section 14 of AT Act of 1985.

10. Before we come to the judgments, referred to and relied upon by the learned counsels for the parties, it is relevant to refer the statutory provisions. Section 2 of the AT Act of 1985 reads as under:-

“2. Act not to apply to certain persons: - The provisions of this Act shall not apply to-

- (a) any member of the naval, military or air forces or of any other armed forces of the Union;



- (b) Clause (b) omitted by Act 19 of 1986, sec. 3 (w.r.e.f. 1.11.1985).
- (c) any officer or servant of the Supreme Court or of any High Court [or courts subordinate thereto];
- (d) any person appointed to the secretarial staff of either House of Parliament or to the secretarial staff of any State Legislature or a House thereof or, in the case of a Union Territory having a Legislature, of that Legislature.

Section 14 of the AT Act of 1985 reads as under:-

“14. Jurisdiction, powers and authority of the Central Administrative Tribunal.- (1) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, the Central Administrative Tribunal shall exercise, on and from the appointed day, all the jurisdiction, powers and authority exercisable immediately before that day by all courts (except the Supreme Court in relation to-

- (a) recruitment, and matters concerning recruitment, to any All-India Service or to any civil service of the Union or a civil post under the Union or to a post connected with defence or in the defence services, being, in either case, a post filled by a civilian;
- (b) all service matters concerning-
 - (i) a member of any All-India Service; or
 - (ii) a person [not being a member of an All-India Service or a person referred to in clause (c)] appointed to any civil service of the Union or any civil post under the Union; or
 - (iii) a civilian [not being a member of an All-India Service or a person



referred in clause (c)] appointed to any defence services or a post connected with defence,

and pertaining to the service of such member, person or civilian, in connection with the affairs of the Union or of any State or of any local or other authority within the territory of India or under the control of the Government of India or of any corporation [or society] owned or controlled by the Government;

- (c) all service matters pertaining to service in connection with the affairs of the Union concerning a person appointed to any service or post referred to in sub-clause (ii) or sub-clause (iii) of clause (b), being a person whose services have been placed by a State Government or any local or other authority or any corporation [or society] or other body, at the disposal of the Central Government for such appointment.

[Explanation - for the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that references to “Union” in this sub-section shall be construed as including references also to a Union territory.]

(2) The Central Government may, by notification, apply with effect from such date as may be specified in the notification the provisions of sub-section (3) to local or other authorities within the territory of India or under the control of the Government of India and to corporations [or societies] owned or controlled by Government, not being a local or other authority or corporation [or society] controlled or owned by a State Government:

Provided that if the Central Government considers it expedient so to do for the purpose of facilitating transition to the scheme as envisaged by this Act, different dates may be so specified under this sub-section in respect of different



classes of, or different categories under any class of, local or other authorities or corporations [or societies].

(3) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, the Central Administrative Tribunal shall also exercise, on and from the date with effect from which the provisions of this sub-section apply to any local or other authority or corporation [or society], all the jurisdiction, powers and authority exercisable immediately before that date by all courts (except the Supreme Court in relation to-

- (a) recruitment, and matters concerning recruitment, to any service or post in connection with the affairs of such local or other authority or corporation [or society]; and
- (b) all service matters concerning a person [other than a person referred to in clause (a) or clause(b) of sub-section (1)]appointed to any service or post in connection with the affairs of such local or other authority or corporation [or society] and pertaining to the service of such person in connection with such affairs.”

Section (2) (c) of the RPF Act of 1957 reads as under:-

“(c) “member of the Force” means a person appointed to the Force under this Act.”

Section 10 of the RPF Act of 1957 reads as under:-

“10. Officers and members of the Force to be deemed to be railway servants.—
4[Director-General and every member of the Force] shall for all purposes be regarded as railway servants with the meaning of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (9 of 1890), other than Chapter VIA thereof, and shall be entitled to exercise the powers conferred on railway servants by or under that Act.”



Section 2 (34) of the Railways Act, 1989 defines 'Railway Servants' and expressly includes members of the Railway Protection Force (clause inserted by amendment to RPF Act in 2003).

Section 42.1 of the Railway Protection Rules, 1987 reads as under:-

“42. Restriction on deployment of Force:

42.1 Notwithstanding anything contained in this Chapter, no member of the Force shall be called upon to carry out any functions relating to law and order (except when detailed under Chapter XVI) or to attend to problems which are purely of an administrative nature requiring certain standard of discipline to be maintained by the railway servants or users of the railways:

Provided that the Force may be deployed to combat mob violence against the safety and security of railway property where there is delay in arrival of the Police or the Magistrate.

***the word 'Principal' inserted vide GSR 140 (E), dated 2nd February, 2018”**

11. On plain reading of the aforesaid statutory provisions *prima facie* indicate that Section 2 (a) of the AT Act of 1985 has taken away the jurisdiction of this Tribunal so far as any member of the navel, military or air forces or of any other armed forces of the Union is concerned. Though the RPF is an armed Force of Union,



however, the provision of Section 2 (c) of the RPF Act of 1957 defines “member of the Force” means a person appointed to the post. However, admittedly, the applicant in the present case has not been appointed to any post under RPF. Further Section 14 of the AT Act of 1985 provides the jurisdiction of this Tribunal qua recruitment, and matters concerning recruitment, to any All-India Service or to any civil service of the Union or a civil post under the Union or to a post connected with defence or in the defence services, wherein in every case the post filled by a civilian. Admittedly, the present matter pertains to the recruitment to a post, which is not a post, which may be construed to be a member of the navel, military or air forces or of any other armed forces of the Union.

12. Now we may deal the judgments referred to and relied upon by the learned counsels for the parties. In the Order/Judgment dated 6.1.2020 in the case of **Swati Yadav** (supra) passed by the Jabalpur Bench of this Tribunal, this Tribunal has ruled in paras 4, 5 and 6, which reads as under:-

“4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the preamble of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957 mentions that, “An Act to provide for the constitution and regulation of any armed Force of the Union for the better protection and security of [railway property, passenger area and passengers] and for matters



connected therewith.]”. He highlighted the fact that this is an armed Force of the Union.

5. Section 2(a) of the Administrative Tribunal Act reads as under:

“2. Act not to apply to certain persons.-
The provisions of this Act shall not apply to
-

(a) any member of the naval, military or air forces or of any other Armed Forces of the Union;”

5.1 From the above, it is very clear that the cases of R.P.F personnel cannot be adjudicated by this Tribunal.

6. We are also fortified by the decision of our coordinate Bench at Calcutta in the case of Bhol Nath Sen vs. Union of India and others, (1991) 16 Administrative Tribunals Cases 125, wherein it has been held that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction under Section 2(1) of the Tribunal Act over the R.P.F. personnel.”

The coordinate Bench of this Tribunal (PB) vide Order/Judgment dated 17.10.2014 in OA 2065/2014 in the case of **Ajay Singh** (supra) has dismissed the said OA.

The said Order/Judgment reads as under:-

“This Original Application has been filed by the applicants seeking the following reliefs and interim relief:-

Main reliefs

a) Set-aside the respondent no.3 rejection letter dated 27.02.2014 along with constitution of committee vide respondents office letter bearing No. 220-E/2/RPF/Ancillary-PT-II dated 29.04.2014;

b) direct the respondents to consider the candidature of the applicant in the process of



cadre change to the rank of constable (Executive) in RPF;

c) direct the respondents to consider the one time relaxation of upper age limit of the applicant for cadre change to the rank of Constable (Executive) in RPF;

d) pass such other or further order as this Hon_ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Interim Reliefs

Grant an ad-interim ex-parte stay of the cadre change process for the Constable (Executive) in RPF in pursuance to notification dated 04.02.2014 issued by the respondents till the final disposal of present OA.

OR,

Direct the respondents to allow the applicant to participate in the process of Cadre Change for the Constable (Executive) in RPF provisionally till the final disposal of present OA.

2. Notice in this case was issued on 17.6.2014 to the respondents returnable on 25.7.2014. In the said order, this Tribunal has also directed the respondents to allow the applicant to participate in the selection process provisionally but not to declare the result of the selection or act upon it without the order of this Tribunal. The respondents have filed their reply on 11.9.2014 stating, inter alia, that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this OA. In this regard, he has referred to Section 2(a) of the Central Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 which says that the said Act will not apply to 'any member of the naval, military or armed force or of any other armed force of the Union'. He has also referred to Section 3 of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957 which says that Railway Protection Force is an armed force of the Union constituted and maintained by the Central Government.



3. In view of the above position we agree with the learned counsel for the respondents and hold that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this Original Application. However, learned counsel for the applicant has requested to allow him to withdraw this OA with liberty to the applicant to approach the appropriate forum.

4. Accordingly, this OA is dismissed as withdrawn. There shall be no order as to costs.”

13. On plain reading of the Order/Judgment of Jabalpur Bench of this Tribunal in the case of **Swati Yadav** (supra), though it is evident that the said OA has been dismissed for want of jurisdiction of this Tribunal in the matter pertaining to the members of the RPF, however, it is not clear as to whether the issue before the Tribunal was about the grievance of a person of the RPF or grievance of the candidate for appointment to a post under the RPF. In the case of **Ajay Singh** (supra) though this Tribunal has dismissed the OA, however, the issue raised in the present case that though the RPF is an armed Force of the Union of India, however, the same is a civil service and unless a person is appointed under the RPF, he does not become a member of that service, therefore, on harmonious reading of Section 2(a) with Section 14 of the AT Act of 1985 has neither been raised nor been adjudicated in any of the cases (supra). In the case of

Sarbeswar Behera (supra), the Hon'ble High Court of

Calcutta has ruled in paras 7, 8 and 11 as under:-



"07. In the present case, we are concerned with recruitment to railway service. The appellants, although are members of an armed force of the Union, are not claiming a right to participate in the recruitment process for appointment on the post of Chief Law Assistant as members of such an armed force but as railway servants in terms of the provisions contained in section 10 of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957 (hereafter '1957 Act'), which reads as follows:

"10. Officers and members of the Force to be deemed to be railway servants.-
20[Director-General and every member of the Force] shall for all purposes be regarded as railway servants within the meaning of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (9 of 1890)21, other than Chapter VI-A thereof, and shall be entitled to exercise the powers conferred on railway servants by or under that Act."

08. If indeed the plinth of the appellants' claim is the provision in section 10 of the 1957 Act, which is argued by Mr. Dey as giving the appellants the right to participate in the relevant examination, we fail to see as to how section 2(a) of the Act of 1985 can pose a bar for the appellants to approach the CAT. The appellants cannot, according to their convenience, shift their stand. They wish to be regarded as railway servants for the purpose of participation in the examination but choose to be regarded as members of an armed force while attempting to invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court. It is clear that the appellants have been blowing hot and cold at the same time, which is impermissible. Since the appellants intend to participate in a process for recruitment initiated by South Eastern Railway, in terms of section 14 of the Act of 1985 the challenge to the order of refusal must be laid before the CAT at the first instance."



“11. It is made abundantly clear that we have not examined the merits of the appellants' claim and all points are left open to be agitated before the CAT for a decision by it in accordance with law.”

14. So far as the reliance placed on the case of **Sri Harananda and others** (supra) is concerned, the issue before the Hon'ble Apex Court is evident from para 10.1 thereof the Judgment, which reads as under:-

“10.1 The short question which is posed for consideration before this Court is, whether in the facts and circumstances of the case, the High Court has committed any error in treating and/or considering the O.M. No. 96/E(GR)I/16/I dated 8.5.2003 of the DoPT, Government of India as ‘in principle’ decision for constitution of the RPF as an Organized Group “A” Central Service and thereby directing to take further steps of Cadre Structure of RPF as also to finalize the Service Rules with reference to the RPF being an Organized Group “A” Central Civil Service?”

The other issue before their Lordships is evident from para 23.1 thereof the Judgment which reads as under:-

“23.1 At the outset, it is required to be noted that the issue in the present Appeals is non grant of NFFU to the Officers/employees like the original Writ Petitioners serving in the CRPF. CRPF in the present case is denied the NFFU solely on the ground that the CRPF is not an Organized Group “A” Service and, therefore, they are denied the benefits of NFFU as recommended by the 6 th Pay Commission as granted to other services.”



15. From the aforesaid, it is evident that in the aforesaid Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the issue was not with regard to the jurisdiction of this Tribunal in relation to the grievance with regard to appointment to a post under RPF. However, in view of the Order/judgment of this Tribunal in **Swati Yadav** (supra) wherein the Jabalpur Bench of this Tribunal has relied upon the Order/Judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta in the case of **Bhola Nath Sen vs. Union of India and others**, reported in (1991) 16 Administrative Tribunals Cases 125, we are of the considered view that the matter needs to be referred to a Larger Bench for authoritative pronouncement on the following issues:-

- (i) Whether grievance qua one's selection/recruitment/appointment to a post under the RPF shall be amenable to the jurisdiction of this Tribunal?
- (ii) Whether the grievance of a member of the RPF shall be amenable to the jurisdiction of this Tribunal? and
- (iii) Whether once the respondents in the relevant vacancy notice has accepted the jurisdiction of this Tribunal, they are estopped from raising an objection qua lack of jurisdiction of this Tribunal after such notification has culminated into final selection for the post(s) under the RPF?

16. In view of the above, the instant matter is required to be referred to Hon'ble the Chairman on administrative side

for constitution of an appropriate Larger Bench for authoritative pronouncement on the aforesaid issues.



(R.N. Singh)
Member (J)

(A. K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

/ravi/