

93

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

D.A. 578/91.

Dt. of Decision : 12-8-1994.

Mr. K. Mangapathi Rao

.. Applicant.

Vs

1. Union of India, rep. by
the Secretary, Dept. of
Personnel & Training,
Administrative Reforms and
Public Services, Central
Secretariat, New Delhi.
2. Union Public Service Commission
rep. by its Secretary,
Dholpur@ house, New Delhi.
3. State of Andhra Pradesh rep.
by the Chief Secretary to
Government (GAD Section) Department,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
4. K. Rami Reddy
5. B. Aravinda Reddy
6. R. Sunder Singh
7. P. Krishniah
8. C. Umamaheshwara Rao

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. P. Naveen Rao for
Mr. Y. Suryanarayana

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC.
Mr. D. Pandurenga Reddy, Spl. counsel
for A.P.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHY : MEMBER (ADMN.)

99

DA.578/91

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, V.C.)

Heard Sri P. Naveen Rao, for Sri Y. Suryanarayana, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri N.V. Ramana, and Sri D. Panduranga Reddy, ~~learned~~ counsel for the respondents.

2. By the time this DA was filed, the applicant was working as Special Grade Deputy Collector. When he was within zone of consideration, ~~for consideration~~ for promotion to IAS from AP State quota for 1990, his case was considered. But he was not empanelled in the Select list for that year. Being aggrieved, the applicant preferred this DA.// From 1982-87, the applicant was on deputation to Fisheries Department and during that period he worked as Administrative Officer, Kolleru lake Development Committee. For the said period, the applicant had written his self-appraisal reports. There was no ~~Reporting Officer~~ ^{accepting officer} above the applicant during the said period. The Accepting Officer was Commissioner of Land Revenue. It is stated for the applicant that the Commissioner of Land Revenue had not counter-signed his Self-Appraisal Report for the said period. While it is urged for the applicant that his ACRs for the relevant period were not considered on the ground that they were not counter-signed by the Commissioner of Land Revenue, the same was denied for the respondents.

for

To

1. The Secretary, Dept.of Personnel and Training,
Union of India, Administrative Reforms
and Public Service, Central Secretariat,
New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, U.P.S.C. Dholpur House, New Delhi.
3. The Chief Secretary to Govt.(GAD Section) Dept.,
State of A.P. Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr.Y.Suryanarayana, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.D.Panduranga Reddy, Spl.Counsel for A.P.Govt.
CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm

3. Today the Record of Proceedings of the Selection Committee, which met on 6-1-1990 for consideration for promotion to IAS from AP State Quota is produced.

It is noted in the said record that the ACR for the period from 6-8-1981 to 30-7-1982 in regard to the applicant was not counter-signed by the Reporting Officer. The Reporting Officer, ^{of relevant period} retired. So, it does not disclose that the remaining period for which the applicant was on duty for the relevant period was countersigned by the Reporting Officer. It is not a case where the Selection Committee endorsed that they could not consider the case of the applicant for want of counter-signature by Reporting/Accepting Officer. As such on the basis of the record, it had to be held that the Selection Committee perused the relevant ACRs of the applicant and they had given the gradings on the basis of his overall performance.

4. It is not a case where any malafides are alleged. Thus, there are no grounds for interfering with the gradings given to the applicant for the year 1990.

5. The OA thus fails and accordingly it is dismissed.
No costs./

(A.B. Gorthi)
Member (Admn)

(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated : August 12, 94
Dictated in Open Court

Deputy Registrar (S)

RECORD
TYPED BY _____ CHECKED BY _____
COMPAED BY _____ APPROVED BY _____

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE
HYDERABAD BENCH AT H

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NE
VICE-CH

AND

A. B. GORH

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJU

DATE. 11-8-1994

~~ORDER~~ JUDGMENT

M.A.No./R.A/C.A.No.

in

O.A.No. 578/91

(T.A.No.

(W.P.No

Admitted and Interim directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

pvm

