

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
KOLKATA BENCH, KOLKATA



No. O.A. 350/01346/2020
M.A. 350/00062/2021

Date of order: 9.8.2021

Present : Hon'ble Ms. Bidisha Banerjee, Judicial Member
Hon'ble Dr. Nandita Chatterjee, Administrative Member

Dhirendra Kumar Sinha,
Aged 62 years,
S/o. Late Shri Shireshar Dayal,
Joint General Manager (Retired),
RITES Limited, Kolkata.

Resident of:

NRC-011, DLF New Town Heights,
New Town, Action Area – III,
Kolkata – 700 135.
Mobile No. : 9073399480

.... Applicant

VERSUS –

RITES Limited,
Through the Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
RITES Bhawan,
Plot No. 1, Sector – 29,
Gurgaon – 122 001.

.... Respondents

For the Applicant : Mr. T.R. Mohanty, Counsel

For the Respondents : Mr. S.K. Das, Counsel

beln

O R D E R (Oral)

Per Dr. Nandita Chatterjee, Administrative Member:

Aggrieved by the marks awarded by the authorities in his Annual Performance Appraisal Report of 2012-13, the applicant has approached this Tribunal under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, praying for the following relief:-

- "1. To allow the present Application;
2. To direct that the impugned Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the Year 2012-2013 [Annexure : A-1] be removed from the Record of the Applicant;

Or alternatively;

3. To quash and set aside the Marks Awarded to the Applicant in the impugned Annual performance Appraisal Report for the year 2012-2013 [Annexure : A-1];
4. To consequently correct the Marks awarded to the Applicant in the impugned Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the Year 2012-2013 [Annexure A-1] from 65 to at least 79.0;
5. To consequently direct the Respondents to Review the Selection of the Applicant for the post Additional Director General (M&C) in terms of the final Orders of the Hon'ble Tribunal in respect of the impugned Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the Year 2015-2016 [Annexure : A-1];
6. To consequently promote the Applicant to the post Additional Director General (M&C) in view of such Review from the date the same was due;
7. To grant all consequential benefits permissible under the Rules and the Law in this regard, including arrears of Salary and Pensionary benefits;
8. To grant compound interest on the arrear payments to be made to the applicant;
9. To issue any such and further orders/directions this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case; and
10. To allow exemplary costs of the application in favour of the applicant."

2. Heard both Ld. Counsel, examined documents on record. This matter is taken up for disposal at the admission stage.
3. Ld. Counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant had joined as Assistant Director (Metallurgy) on 16.6.1995, and, thereafter, on 4.5.2007 had joined RITES Limited as Deputy General Manager (M&C). He was promoted to the posts of Senior Deputy General Manager (M&C) and

he/w

Joint General Manager (M&C) respectively, and, thereafter, was called to appear before a Selection Committee on 16.11.2017 for appointment to the post of Additional General Manager (M&C).

The applicant is aggrieved that, although he was the only candidate to be considered for promotion to the said post of Additional General Manager (M&C), and, although, he did attend the interview, the outcome was never made known to him, and, accordingly, had approached this Tribunal in its Principal Bench in O.A. No. 100/00061/2018 (Annexure A-2 to the O.A.), which was disposed of with a direction upon the respondent authorities to communicate the outcome of the interview for promotion to the post of Additional General Manager (M&C) to the applicant.

That, thereafter, the authorities vide their communication at Annexure A-3 to the O.A., informed the applicant, that, as he could not secure the qualifying marks, namely, 80% marks in aggregate, he could not be recommended for selection as Additional General Manager (M&C) by the Selection Committee. The break up of the applicant's performance in the said selection was recorded as follows:-

APARs Score (last 5 years) (60)	Presentation (10)	Interview (30)	Total Marks (100)	Remarks
44	7	21	72	Fail

Thereafter, in response to an RTI application of the applicant, his APAR scores were disclosed on 3.5.2018 as follows:-

hsl

Year	APAR rating
2009	VG
2010	79.0
2011	85.5
2012	83.02
2013	67.0
2014	83.4
2015	80.3
2016	58.8
2017	80.65
2018	Yet to be finalized. On finalization of the APAR, the same will be disclosed to Shri D.K. Sinha.

The applicant's Ld. Counsel admitted during hearing, that, for each reporting year, his APARs since 2009 had been duly conveyed to him by the respondent authorities and the applicant, having ascertained that his APAR scores for the last 5 years, being 44 as against the requisite score of 60, had prevented him from qualifying for selection to the post of Additional General Manager (M&C), has approached this Tribunal for relief.

4. Although the applicant would cite the decision in **O.A. No. 1973/2014 (Tushar Ranjan Mohanty v. Union of India & ors.)**, we find that in the case of **T.R. Mohanty (supra)** the applicant had submitted a comprehensive representation against his adverse and below bench mark APARs. The instant applicant, however, despite the fact that he was communicated his APAR for the year 2012-2013 in due time, had not submitted any representation seeking improvement/upgradation of his APAR grades to the competent authority.

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant would refer to Annexure A-13 to the O.A. in which the applicant had, on the one hand, preferred a representation on his APARs of 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 respectively, but

hah

there is nothing on record to substantiate that he had represented for upgrading his APAR ratings for his APAR of 2012-2013.

6. In ***State Bank of India vs. A.P. Mathai, 1988 (4) SLR 94 (Bom)***, the Hon'ble Apex Court had ruled that the proper course would be to direct the competent authority to dispose of the representation and depending on the result thereof to reconsider the action taken.

In ***Gunjan Prasad v. Government of India [MANU/CA/0278/2015]***, the Tribunal held as under:-

"The disposal of the representation must be made in a quasi judicial manner by a reasoned order on due application of mind."

7. Accordingly, we would dispose of this O.A. at the admission stage itself, by according liberty to the applicant to prefer a reasoned representation to the competent authority to justify his request for upgrading of his APAR, if so required, for the reporting year 2012-2013, within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Once so received, the competent authority shall decide on such representation, in accordance with law, and upon an objective review of his APAR gradings, convey such decision to the applicant, within a period of 6 weeks thereafter.

8. Further, we make it clear that we have not entered into the merits of the matter and the respondents are at liberty to decide on the issues raised in accordance with law.

9. With these directions, the O.A. is disposed of. No costs.

M.A. bearing No. 350/00062/2021 is disposed of accordingly.


(Dr. Nandita Chatterjee)
Administrative Member


(Bidisha Banerjee)
Judicial Member

SP