

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

**O.A. No. 340/2004**

**Friday this the 20th day of October, 2006**

**CORAM :**

**HON'BLE Mr.K.B.S.RAJAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER  
HON'BLE MR.N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

1. K.V.P. Sarada,  
D/o Balakrishna Kurup,  
Upper Division Clerk,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram.
2. M.J.Paulose,  
S/o M.A.Joseph,  
Upper Division Clerk,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. Unnikrishnan Nair.K.,  
S/o K.P.Karunakaran,  
Lower Division Clerk,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram.
4. Unni.J.,  
S/o Janardhana Kurukal,  
Lower Division Clerk,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram.
5. P.S.Sureshkumar,  
Lower Division Clerk,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram. : Applicants

**(By Advocate Mr. P.V.Mohanan )**

**Versus**

1. Indian Council of Agricultural Research,  
represented by its Secretary,  
Indian Council of Agricultural Research,  
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Director,  
Central Tuber Crops Research Institute,  
Sreekariyam, Thiruvananthapuram. : Respondents

**(By Advocate Mr. P Jacob Varghese)**



The application having been heard on 22.09.2006, the Tribunal on 20.10.2006 delivered the following :

**ORDER**

**HON'BLE MR.N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

The applicants in this O.A are aggrieved by the perceived inaction of the employers to mitigate stagnation in their ranks for want of promotional opportunities.

2. The applicants, five in number are working as LDCs and UDCs in the Central Tuber Crops Research Institute (CTCRI), which is under the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR). The posts of the Council are categorised as Scientific, Technical and Administrative. The problems of stagnation in the administrative category employees were studied by a High Power Committee. In pursuance of the same, a Cadre Review Committee was formed, to take up the review of the existing cadre strength of administrative category. The said committee recommended upgradation of 1255 posts in the research Institutes under the ICAR to remove stagnation of employees with more than ten years of service. Details of such employees were required in pursuance of A-1 document dated 7.9.98 by the ICAR. Vide A-2 document dated 13.10.98 of the ICAR, it was required of the Institute to calculate matching savings on surrender of lower posts. Further details were asked for by the ICAR vide A-4 document dated 26.3.99. In pursuance of a letter from the ICAR dated 5.9.2000 (not part of the material papers) the Institute sent A-5 document dated 20.1.2001 certain details. Vide A-6 document dated 13.7.2001 of the ICAR, the Institute was asked to confirm whether the proposed surrender of posts was part of an independent cut of 10% posts. This was followed



by a reminder dated 9.8.2001 of the A-7. Further correspondence followed with no decision in sight. This, the applicants allege as lethargy, on the part of the respondents leading to stagnation of their prospects.

3. Hence, a direction is sought to be issued by the Tribunal to upgrade the administrative posts in terms of orders passed vide A-1 document. They rest their claims on the following grounds:

- i) The Scientific and Technical categories officers have better promotion prospects than the employees of the Administrative categories.
- ii) In fact, the scheme has been implemented in other Institutes of the ICAR.

4. In reply, respondents put forth the following points to resist the application.

- i) Comparison with other Institutes of the ICAR may not be tenable inasmuch as there is difference in the staff strength in such Institutes of all categories from that of the CTCRI.
- ii) The CTCRI could not provide matching savings which is condition precedent for implementing the stagnation-mitigation exercise.
- iii) In any case, with the introduction of the ACP scheme, the stagnation aspect has already been taken care of.

5. Heard the parties and perused the documents including the argument note submitted by the learned counsel for the applicants.

6. On the available records, the reason for non-implementation of the upgradation scheme as pointed out in the reply statement, is the inability of the CTCRI to provide matching savings. The statement further points out that the introduction of the ACP scheme would go a long way in mitigating,



to certain extent, the question of stagnation. The applicants have not countered any of the two arguments. Presumably, the ACP scheme should be in operation in the ICAR and with that the grievance of stagnation should have been met to some extent. No orders of the respondents have been impugned by the applicants either.

7. Under these circumstances, we find that no case exists for any intervention to be issued by the Tribunal.

8. Hence, we order that the O.A is dismissed. No costs.

Dated, the 20th October, 2006.



N.RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



K.B.S.RAJAN  
JUDICIAL MEMBER

trs