

(64)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 555 (Hyd) of 1995

dt. 11-6-97.

Present : Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Chatterjee, Vice-Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. P.T. Thiruvengadam, Administrative Member

Aged 40 years, Section Officer, Central  
Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench,  
Hyderabad.

..... Applicant

-Versus-

1. The Government of India, represented  
by Secretary to Government, Department  
of Personnel & Training, Central Secre-  
tariat, New Delhi - 110 001 ;

2. The Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Principal Bench, represented by its  
Registrar, Copernicus Marg,  
New Delhi - 110 001 ;

Hyderabad Bench, represented by its  
Registrar, HACA Bhawan, Hyderabad-500 004.

..... Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : Mr. Y. Suryanarayana

Counsel for the respondents : Mr. N.R. Devaraj

Heard on : 4.3.1997 - Order on : 11-6-97.

O R D E R

A.K. Chatterjee, VC

Stripped of unnecessary details, the relevant facts are that the petitioner, who was formerly a Deputy Section Officer in Andhra Pradesh High Court w.e.f. 5.3.1985 carrying a pay scale of Rs. 1380-2750/- (RS) came over to the Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as the Tribunal) as a Section Officer on deputation in the pay scale of Rs. 2000-3500/- (Revised

on 12.6.1986<sup>1986</sup>. Rules for recruitment to various posts in the Tribunal were framed later and came into effect on 20.9.89, which provided, inter alia, for absorption of deputationists subject to fulfilment of certain conditions. The conditions among others were that a deputationist subject to his exercising option may be absorbed in a particular post if he was eligible for such post according to the norms laid down in the rule itself. The petitioner duly exercised option for absorption as a Section Officer but by an order dated 28.5.90, Annexure A/IV to the application, he was absorbed as an Assistant w.e.f. 1.11.89. It was, however, laid down in the order that he was allowed to continue to officiate as a Section Officer on an adhoc basis till he was regularised as such. The petitioner has been making representations to treat him as a Section Officer from the date of his deputation on 12.6.1986, but to no effect. He was ultimately promoted as a Section Officer by an order made on 3.5.1994. He has filed the instant application for a declaration that he should be deemed to have been appointed as a Section Officer with effect from the date of his joining in the Tribunal i.e. 12.6.1986 and other consequential reliefs on the following broad grounds.

2. i) A circular issued by the Tribunal dated 14.10.91, Annexure A/VI to the application, specifically provided that in respect of employees absorbed in the Tribunal w.e.f. 1.11.89, the services rendered by them in the Tribunal prior to promulgation of Recruitment Rules will be deemed to be regular service in that grade even if the appointment was made on an adhoc basis.

ii) The petitioner by continuously officiating as a Section Officer since 12.6.86 against a substantive post with all benefits attached to such post is entitled to count his service from the said date.

[illegible]

2. The above named person is not a member of the Communist Party of the United States, and he is not a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

4. The defendant has failed to establish that the  
 station is such host.

[illegible]

3. y conufoz puz psoo t pfoq pa 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099 1100 1101 1102 1103 1104 1105 1106 1107

could not be a list of individuals who were not  
 from among the subjects of the investigation. It is not  
 those who were not subjects of the investigation who were not

[illegible]

iii) The petitioner having been assured that his services as Section Officer could be regularised as soon as formalities would be completed, the authorities cannot turn round to deny him the benefit of regularisation as Section Officer with effect from 12.6.1986.

3. A counter has been filed by the Tribunal impleaded as respondent No.2 on behalf of all the respondents. It has been stated that despite his option, the petitioner could not be absorbed as a Section Officer as he had not completed 8(eight) years of regular service as an Assistant on 1.11.1989, which was the eligibility laid down in the recruitment rules for appointment as a Section Officer and only to avoid his reversion or repatriation and thus only to be fair to him, he was allowed to continue to officiate as a Section Officer on an adhoc basis till his regularisation in such post.

4. The petitioner has filed a rejoinder disputing, inter alia, that he was not eligible for absorption as Section Officer.

5. We have heard the Id.Counsel for both the parties and perused the records before us.

6. We are in no doubt that the circular issued by the Tribunal on 14.10.91, Annexure A/VI to the application does not in any way come to the aid of the petitioner. Obviously, the Tribunal was not competent to take a decision regarding counting of service rendered prior to the promulgation of the Recruitment Rules for the simple reason that the Administrative Department for the Tribunal being the Department of Personnel, only that Department could issue such an order. It has been so observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.2277-78 of 1996 and ultimately the aforesaid order was even withdrawn by the Tribunal. In such situation, the circular dated 14.10.91 upon which reliance has

been placed by the petitioner does not in any way improve his case.

7. The plea of the petitioner of continuous officiation as a Section Officer against a substantive post since 12.6.36 is equally useless to support his case for regularisation of his service as Section Officer from the said date. The regularisation of service as Section Officer, which means his appointment as such on a regular basis as distinguished from an adhoc basis can only be made in terms of the relevant provision of the recruitment rules.

8. The fact that his adhoc appointment was against a substantive post for the post of Section Officer but it does not confer upon him any right to claim regularisation if he did not fulfil the eligibility conditions as laid down in the Recruitment Rules. If he was found eligible but regularisation was denied for want of vacancy, then only he could possibly argue that adhoc appointment having been made against a substantive post, non-availability of vacancy could not be a ground to deny appointment on a regular basis. Enjoyment by the petitioner of benefits are only normal incidents of holding the post even on ad-hoc basis and it cannot be a foundation of his claim for regularisation of his service as Section Officer since 12.6.1936.

9. The petitioner has urged that an assurance was held out to him that his service as Section Officer would be regularised as soon as <sup>option</sup> upon formalities were completed and upon such assurance he accepted absorption as an Assistant. As far as we could understand, the petitioner has tried to build up a case of a sort of estoppel and it was contended that if there was no such assurance, he would have preferred repatriation to the parent department, which

offer~~made~~<sup>a</sup> much better career prospect and eventually he could be appointed as<sup>a</sup> District Munsif. The supposed assurance is to be found in the order absorbing him as an Assistant, Annexure-A/IV to the application, which provided that he would be allowed to continue to officiate as a Section Officer on an ad-hoc basis till he was regularised in that post. This does not even remotely imply that his adhoc appointment as Section Officer would be counted for regularisation of his service as Section Officer and cannot, therefore, constitute any assurance to that effect. Further the order containing the so-called assurance was made after the Recruitment Rules were framed and no person of ordinary prudence could assume that regular appointment as Section Officer could be made in disregard<sup>4</sup> to the provision of the said rules. It is hard to imagine how the petitioner after a specific order absorbing him as an Assistant with effect from 1.11.1989 could still believe that he would be absorbed in the higher post of Section Officer from a much earlier date. Even<sup>4</sup> he had so believed, the Tribunal cannot be said to have induced such belief in him and thus it cannot be held responsible for the inconvenience or loss, if any, suffered by the petitioner by acting upon such belief.

10. The Ld.Counsel for the petitioner has urged that the order of the Tribunal absorbing the petitioner as an Assistant without accepting his option to be absorbed as a Section Officer was in substance a counter offer and the petitioner had no opportunity to accept or reject it. We are unable to find any merit in this contention. If really the petitioner was not willing to be absorbed as an Assistant, nothing prevented him to part company with the Tribunal and thus if he regarded his absorption as a counter offer, he had enough opportunity to reject it and revert to his parent department, which, according to him, offered much better prospect of promotion.

11. The petitioner has also raised a question of seniority, though this is not directly linked to his case seeking regularisation as a Section Officer w.e.f. 12.6.36. He has stated that in the final seniority list of Assistants of Hyderabad Bench, his name had appeared against Srl.No.1, but in the combined seniority list of Assistants prepared by the Principal Bench, he was relegated to the <sup>18th</sup> ~~first~~ place. This is an argument of no consequence because the petitioner even though held the top most position among the Assistants of Hyderabad Bench, could be depressed to a lower place in the seniority list prepared in respect of all the Assistants located in different Benches. Indeed, the petitioner gave a representation against the seniority list prepared by the Principal Bench in which he ventilated his grievance only regarding date of his regular appointment in the parent department and the date from which his seniority was to be counted. He never raised any question that as he held the top most place in the seniority list of Assistants in Hyderabad Bench, his position should have been fixed at a higher place in the combined list prepared by the Principal Bench. Further it does not appear that there was any error to the dis-advantage of the petitioner regarding the date from which his seniority was to be counted as an Assistant. This date has been noted as 12.6.36, which was the date on which he had joined the Tribunal on deputation. The petitioner contended in his representation that he was regularly appointed as a Deputy Section Officer in A.P.High Court on 5.3.35 which should have been recorded as the date of regular appointment in parent department. According to the D.O.P.T. O.M. dated 3.7.36, seniority of an absorbed deputationist cannot be determined under any circumstances with reference to a date prior to his date of joining on deputation and, therefore, the seniority of the petitioner as an Assistant could not be fixed with

reference to any date earlier than 12.6.36. Thus, the seniority of the petitioner as shown in the seniority list of Assistants appeared to be free from doubt.

12. In the rejoinder filed by the petitioner, he has disputed the stand of the respondents that the post of Deputy Section Officer held by him in Andhra Pradesh High Court was not equivalent to the post of Assistant in the Tribunal. ~~This contention is irrelevant as far as relief prayed for by the petitioner is concerned,~~ but even if both the posts are held to be equivalent, the seniority as an Assistant in the Tribunal cannot be counted with reference to any date anterior to his date of joining the Tribunal on deputation. Nor can it be said that he had put in 8 years of service as an Assistant on 12.6.36 even counting his service as Deputy Section Officer in A.P. High Court since 5.3.35.

13. The contention of the respondents as stated in their counter was that the post of Section Officer held by the petitioner on officiating ad-hoc basis w.e.f. 12.6.36 was deemed to have been served in the feeder cadre of Assistant as the post of Deputy Section Officer held by him in the parent Department w.e.f. 5.8.35 was not analogous to the post of Assistant in the Tribunal. Thus, according to the respondents, the petitioner did not complete 8 years of service as an Assistant even on 3.5.94 when he was promoted as a Section Officer which was effected only by giving relaxation by the competent authority. Regarding this contention, the petitioner has stated in the rejoinder that if it was found desirable to exercise the power of relaxation for giving promotion on 3.5.94, there was hardly any justification why relaxation could not be given earlier despite the promise made on 28.5.90. We are unable to make much of this argument and suffice it to say that it is entirely for the concerned authority to decide on the basis of



exigency of situation whether relaxation was called for. It is only a repetition to mention that there was nothing in the order dated 28.5.90 which might be regarded as an assurance to the petitioner that his adhoc appointment as Section Officer could be counted for regularisation of his service as such.

14. The petitioner has also contended in the rejoinder that the respondents were in error in stating that the post of Deputy Section Officer in Andhra Pradesh High Court was not equivalent to the post of Assistant in the Tribunal solely on the basis of consideration of pay scale attached to the post and disregarding the relevant orders on the subject issued by the Govt. of India. The question of equivalence of post is mainly relevant for the purpose of determination of seniority in the grade in which a deputationist is absorbed but for the purpose of absorption, the eligibility condition as laid down in the recruitment rules has to be fulfilled. It was not the case of the petitioner that the Deputy Section Officer in the High Court is a post higher than that of an Assistant in the Tribunal and it has already been pointed out that even by counting his service as Deputy Section Officer from 5.8.85, he did not become eligible for appointment as a Section Officer in the Tribunal on 12.6.86.

15. In this connection, the petitioner has also pointed out that in the Office Memorandum of D.O.P.T. dt.14.2.86 by which proposals were invited to <sup>draw</sup>~~drop~~ up panels for filling up certain posts in the Tribunal, eligibility condition for the purpose of Section Officer was satisfied by him, which was why he was appointed as such on 12.6.86. Thus, according to the petitioner, the decisions to absorb him as an Assistant and to regularise his service as Section Officer only from 3.5.84 are clearly unsustainable. This contention has to be rejected. The Office Memorandum dt.14.2.86

referred to above laid down the eligibility condition only for selection on deputation. This O.M. <sup>contains</sup> ~~contends~~ no provision whatsoever that prospective deputationist would be absorbed to the post deputed on the basis of the same eligibility condition. For the purpose of absorption, the relevant provision in the Recruitment Rules are the guiding consideration, which cannot be overlooked and thus in the present case, the petitioner could not be absorbed as Section Officer w.e.f. 12.6.86 for want of requisite eligibility as laid down in those rules.

16. Mr. Devaraj, the Id. Sr. Counsel appearing for the respondents has urged that the grievance, if any, of the petitioner had arisen as soon as he was absorbed as an Assistant by <sup>the</sup> ~~an~~ order dt. 28.5.90 and this matter cannot be agitated in the present application filed on 18.4.95. The petitioner's answer to this contention is that the cause of action arose for the first time only when he was promoted as a Section Officer prospectively w.e.f. 3.5.94 and thus this application has been filed well in time. After giving anxious consideration to the rival contentions, we find a good deal of force in the argument of Mr. Devaraj. As the entire case of the petitioner is that his absorption as an Assistant w.e.f. 1.11.89 by the order dt. 28.5.90 is illegal, it is impossible to hold that the petitioner had no grievance at that time. The petitioner no doubt contends that the issue was kept open and it was only finally decided against him when he was absorbed as a Section Officer w.e.f. 3.5.94. There is no merit in this contention because as already pointed out, there was no assurance or even any remote <sup>implication</sup> ~~application~~ in the order dt. 28.5.90 that the petitioner was likely to be absorbed as a Section Officer w.e.f. 12.6.86, as prayed by him in this application or even from any particular date. The petitioner has also contended that ever since the order dt. 28.5.90 he has been

making representation but was not favoured with any reply. The respondents have stated that the representations were duly considered and rejected but it does not appear that the rejections were communicated to the petitioner. But even assuming that the petitioner was not intimated about disposal of his representation, it does not follow that he could wait indefinitely to ventilate his grievance before the Tribunal. Indeed, filing of a representation being not a statutory remedy, he could make an application as soon as the order dated 28.5.90 was passed or within one year thereafter. And in any case, when he received no response to his first representation even within six months of making the same, he should have made the application within one year thereafter. We, therefore, hold that the present application cannot be entertained at this distant point of time even if it was sustainable on merit, though we have already indicated that we find no substance in the case made out by the petitioner.

17. Before parting <sup>with</sup> this case, we should like to add a few more words. We have also heard an application filed by another Court Officer of the Hyderabad Bench of the Tribunal, Shri A. Surinder Reddy being O.A. No. 1218/95, wherein he had also ventilated his grievance that inspite of exercising option for absorption as a Court Officer, he was absorbed as an Assistant w.e.f. 1.11.89 like the present petitioner. The judgment in that case is being delivered separately. It was, however, stated that both the cases were identical in nature, which we find is only partially true. Both the petitioners have no doubt prayed for absorption as <sup>Section Officer</sup> Court Officer (though from different dates), but the grounds for such claim are altogether different. The case of Sri Surinder Reddy was that in the parent department, he held an analogous post and, therefore, he was eligible for absorption as a Court Officer with effect from 1.11.89 in accordance with the provisions as contained

in the Schedule to the relevant Recruitment Rules, while in the present case, the petitioner Shri T. Narendar Reddy never claimed that he held an analogous post in the parent Department but prayed for absorption as Section Officer on the ground of continuous officiation as such, <sup>for</sup> ~~on~~ the supposed assurance held out to him and on the basis of circular issued by the Tribunal dated 14.10.91. Thus, the scope of the enquiry in the two cases is quite different.

18. Thus, considering the case of the petitioner in all its bearing, we are unable to grant ~~to grant~~ to the petitioner the relief prayed by him and the application is accordingly rejected.

19. Parties to bear their own costs.

*P. J. Thiruvengadam*  
( PT THIRUVENGADAM )  
Member(A)

*A.K. Chatterjee*  
( A.K. CHATTERJEE )  
Vice-Chairman

*11-6-97*  
*D.N.O.*

12.12.11

Copy to:

1. The Secretary to Govt., Dept. of Personnel & Training,  
Central Secretariat, New Delhi.
2. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Principal Bench, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.
3. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal,  
HACA Bhavan, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. Y. Suryanarayana, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to D.R(A), CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One duplicate copy.

YLKR

28/6/97  
HYD.  
7  
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY  
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD

A.K. Chatterjee, v.c.

THE HON'BLE SHRI ~~R. RANGARAJAN: M(A)~~

AND

P.T. Thiruvengadam: M(A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI ~~B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR: M~~  
(J)

DATED: 11/6/87

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

M.A./R.A/C.A. NO.

in

O.A. NO. 555/85

Admitted and Interim directions  
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions,

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

YLKR

II Court.

