IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

ORDER RESERVED ON 12.12.2014

DATE OF ORDER : 9.1.2015

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. B.V. RAO, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR.ANIL KUMAR, ADMINISITRATIVE MEMBER

1. **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 768/2013**

Rohit Mahajan son of Shri G.L. Mahajan, aged 57 years, resident of A-10, Indraprastha, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur (Currently posted as SP, CID (Civil Rights), Rajasthan, Jaipur.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S.S. Hora)

Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension through its Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Union Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shajahan Road, New Delhi.
3. The State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Rajathan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Director General of Police, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
7. Shri Ravi Kant Mittal, Deputy Inspector General of Police (RAC), Police Head Quarter, Jaipur.
8. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Government of India, New Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Mukesh Agarwal – Respondent nos. 1 & 8
Mr. D.C. Sharma – Respondent no. 2.
Mr. V.D. Sharma – Respondent nos. 3 to 6
None for respondent no. 7)

2. **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 780/2013**
WITH
MISC APPLICATION NO. 291/00297/2014

Praveen Sharma son of Shri Shiv Shankar Sharma, aged 59 years, resident of F-49, Lal Bahadur Nagar, Jaipur (Currently posted as Superintendent of Police (CID-CB), Police Head Quarters, Jaipur.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S.S. Hora)

Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension through its Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Union Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shajahan Road, New Delhi.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Government of India.
4. The State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
7. Shri Bal Mukund Verma, Assistant Inspector General of Police (AIG), Training Police Head Quarter, Jaipur.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Mukesh Agarwal – Respondent nos. 1 & 3
Mr. D.C. Sharma – Respondent no. 2.
Mr. V.D. Sharma – Respondent nos. 4 to 6
Mr. Tanveer Ahmed – Respondent no. 7)

3. **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 820/2013**

Veerbhan Ajwani son of Late Shri G.D. Ajwani, aged 59 years, resident of P-124, Railway Bungalow, Kutcheri Road, Ajmer (Currently posted as Superintendent of Police) GRP, Ajmer.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S.S. Hora)

Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension through its Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Union Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.

3. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Government of India, New Delhi.
4. The State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Mukesh Agarwal –Respondent nos. 1 & 3
Mr. D.C. Sharma – Respondent no. 2.
Mr. V.D. Sharma – Respondent nos. 4 to 6)

4. **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 291/00031/2014**
WITH
MISC. APPLICATION NO. 291/00295/2014

Hari Prasad Sharma son of Shri Banshi Dhar Sharma, aged 55 years, resident of 69, Rani Sati Nagar, Ajmer Road, Jaipur (currently posted as Superintendent of Police, Sriganganagar).

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S.S. Hora)

Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension through its Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Union Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shajahan Road, New Delhi.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Government of India,
4. The State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Rajathan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
7. Shri Bal Mukund Verma, Assistant Inspector General of Police (AIG) Training, Police Head Quarter, Jaipur.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Mukesh Agarwal – Respondent nos. 1 & 3
Mr. D.C. Sharma – Respondent no. 2.
Mr. V.D. Sharma – Respondent nos. 4 to 6
Mr. Tanveer Ahmed – Respondent no. 7)

5. **ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 291/00032/2014**
WITH
MISC. APPLICATION NO. 291/00296/2014

Bahadur Singh Rathaur son of Shri Khem Singh Rathaur, aged 58 years, resident of C-5, Indrapuri, Lal Kothi, Jaipur.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S.S. Hora)

Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension through its Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Union Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shajahan Road, New Delhi.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Government of India.
4. The State of Rajasthan through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Director General of Police, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
7. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Rajathan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
8. Shri Bal Mukund Verma, Assistant Inspector General of Police (AIG) Training, Police Head Quarter, Jaipur.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Mukesh Agarwal – Respondent nos. 1 & 3
Mr. D.C. Sharma – Respondent no. 2.
Mr. V.D. Sharma – Respondent nos. 4 to 7
Mr. Tanveer Ahmed – Respondent no. 8)

ORDER

PER HON'BLE MR. ANIL KUMAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Since these five OAs have similar facts and question of law, therefore, with the consent of the parties, the OAs were heard together and are being disposed of by a common order. For the sake of convenience, the OA No. 780/2013 (Praveen Sharma vs. Union of India) is being taken as a lead case.

2. The applicant has filed the present OA praying for the following reliefs:-

> "(i) By an appropriate order this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to direct the respondents to convene a Review Selection Board for the IPS and be further pleased to direct the respondents to grant the applicant seniority from the year 2000 or earlier as per entitlement of the length of service in the RPS.
>
> (ii) Any other order which this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the present case may kindly be passed in favour of the applicant."

3. The brief facts in the present OA are that the applicant was a member of State Police Service and that he was promoted to the IPS. However, his seniority was restricted because one Shri Bal Mukund Verma, respondent no. 7, was senior to the applicant in the seniority list dated 28.12.2005 (Annexure A/13) of the State Police Service (RPS) at the time when the select list was initially finalized. The applicant was assigned the seniority of 2001 in IPS. Subsequently, the seniority list of State Police Service Officers was revised vide order dated 15.03.2013 (Annexure A/17) and in the revised seniority list, the name of the applicant is placed higher than Shri Bal Mukund Verma. The applicant was initially entitled to seniority of 09 years but the same was restricted with reference to one assigned to his senior officer (Shri Bal Mukund Verma) in the same select list. The length of service of Shri Bal Mukund Verma in the State Police Service was less than the applicant. However, as per rules, the seniority of the applicant in IPS was

restricted to the seniority given to Shri Bal Mukund Verma in IPS. Now, as per the Review DPC of State Police Officers, Shri Bal Mukund Verma has been placed junior to the applicant in the seniority in the RPS, hence the seniority list of the IPS is also need to be reviewed accordingly.

4. That the applicant submitted his representation to the State Government and his representation has been finally decided by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, vide letter dated 11.07.2014. In this letter, it has been informed that UPSC has informed that in absence of any enabling provision in the promotion regulations to review the Select Lists, the Commission cannot review such Select Lists unless there is specific direction for the same from a Court of law. There being no amendment in the Select Lists, this Ministry is not in a position to revise subsequent seniority of the applicant in the Indian Police Service. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that in the same order, it has been mentioned that the Select Lists from 2001 to 2009 for promotion to IPS cadre of Uttar Pradesh were reviewed. However, in the case of Rajasthan, there is no specific Court direction to review any Select List for which seniority of eligible officers is revised with retrospective effect, but after the Select Lists were approved and acted upon. Therefore, the learned counsel for the applicant argued that directions be issued to the respondents to convene the Review DPC and assign the correct seniority to the applicant in the IPS.

5. On the other hand, official respondents nos. 4 to 6 in their written reply have submitted that seniority of the Indian Police Service Officers are governed by Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1988. That promotion of the State Police Service Officer to the IPS is governed by Rule-5 of the IPS (Appointment by Promotion) Regulation, 1955. There is no enabling provision in the regulation to review a select list which has already been approved by the UPSC and acted upon by the Government of India.

6. The official respondents have also stated in their reply that the applicant has not challenged the validity of either Rule 3 of the Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules 1988 which govern the seniority of the IPS Officers nor the applicant has challenged the validity of Rule 5 of the IPS (Appointment by Promotion) Regulation, 1955. Therefore, no relief can be granted to the applicant at this stage.

7. The respondents have stated that a notification for appointment to IPS was issued on 16.02.2009 and the applicant was appointed against the select list of 2008 and Shri Bal Mukund Verma, private respondent no. 7, was appointed earlier to the applicant. Since the applicant was appointed to service below Shri Bal Mukund Verma, hence keeping in view of proviso given below Regulation 3(3)(ii) Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1988, he was assigned 2000 as

year of allotment. The select list was prepared on the basis of seniority list of the State Police Service Officers as existing at that point of time.

8. The official respondents have also stated in their reply that subsequently on account of a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Salauddin Ahmad vs. Samta Andolan,** Civil Appeal No. 2504-2505 of 2012 decided on 29.08.2012, the seniority list of State Police Service Officers was revised. However, since there is no enabling provision in the Indian Police Service (Appointment by Promotion) Regulation, 1955 to convene a Review Selection Committee meeting, hence the claim of the applicant for revision of seniority in IPS cannot be accepted.

9. The official respondent no. 2, UPSC, in Para NO. 5.2, of its written statement have stated that there is no enabling provision in the Promotion Regulations to review the Select Lists which have already been acted upon by the Government of India. In the instant case, the recommendations of the Selection Committee which met on 31.10.2007 for preparation of the Select List of 2007 for promotion of SPS Officers to the IPS of Rajasthan Cadre was approved by the Commission vide letter dated 17.12.2007 and acted upon by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs vide notification dated 01.01.2008. Therefore, in the instant case, the Commission has no power to review the Select List prepared and acted upon. Further, the

Government of India, Department of Personnel and Training are the nodal agency for framing, interpreting and amending the Promotion Regulations. As they have been impleaded in the instant OA as Respondent No. 1, their submission in this regard may kindly be perused by the Hon'ble Tribunal.

10. The official respondent No. 3 i.e. Ministry of Home Affairs in its written reply have stated that UPSC is wholly concerned with reference to Select List prepared and approved under Regulation7(3) on the basis of grading made by the Selection Committee and with the aid of observations of the State and the Central Government. The Central Government is the authority concerned in making appointment from the select list on the recommendations of the State Government in the order in which the names of the members of the State Police Service appear in the select list being in force during its validity period. They have further stated that the State Government being the sole custodian of service record of State Police Officers is required to furnish a proposal to convene a meeting of the Selection Committee/ Review Committee, along with a list of eligible State Police Service Officers and their service records, integrity certificate etc. direct to the UPSC. The Central Government nominates its nominees on the Selection Committee as & when the Commission fixes the meeting. The matter relating to convene of a Review Selection Committee Meeting is entirely under the purview of the UPSC and the State Government. Therefore, it is for the Commission and the

Government of Rajasthan to make a detailed submission in the matter. They have further stated that unless the UPSC alters the Select List, the Ministry of Home Affairs will not be in a position to alter the seniority list of the Officers in the IPS.

11. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents on record. The basic facts of the OA are not disputed that when a select list for the year 2007-2008 was prepared by the UPSC, private respondent no. 7 i.e. Shri Bal Mukund Verma was senior to the applicant and hence he was placed above the applicant in the select list. The seniority of Shri Bal Mukund Verma was fixed in the IPS for the year 2000 and, therefore, as per Rule 3 of Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1988 of the officers below him in the select list were given the seniority below Shri Bal Mukund Verma even though some of the State Police Service Officers may have worked for longer years in the State Police Service than Shri Bal Mukund Verma. This fact is not disputed either by the applicant or by the respondents.

12. The learned counsel for official respondents nos. 4 to 6 and also the learned counsel for private respondent no. 7 argued that the present OA has been filed beyond limitation because the select list was prepared in the year 2008 and whereas the applicant has challenged the select list in the year 2013. The learned counsel for private respondent no. 7 relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan,

Jaipur Bench, in the case of **Kamlesh Kumar Sharma vs. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd. & Others,** decided on 30.05.2008, 2009(6) SLR 291, in which Hon'ble High Court held that the seniority list of 2001 should have been challenged in 2001 itself and appellant was not prevented in approaching this Court. Now at this stage, it is not open to the appellant to challenge the correctness of the said seniority list. The seniority list of 2001 was challenged by the appellant in the year 2007 on the basis of revised seniority list, which was issued on 29.05.2007.

13. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that in the present OA there is no question of limitation involved. The State Government revised the seniority list of the State Police Service Officers after the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 29.08.2012 in the case of **Salauddin Ahmad & Another vs. Samta Andolan** (supra) and, therefore, when the State Government revised the seniority list of the State Police Service Officers, the applicant became senior to Shri Bal Mukund Verma. He further submitted that the judgment relied upon by the learned counsel for private respondent no. 7, Shri Bal Mukund Verma, is not applicable under the facts & circumstances of the present OA. In the case before the Hon'ble High Court, the seniority list of the Assistant Engineers was published on 30.05.2001 and another seniority list was issued on 29.05.2007, which was merely reiteration of the inter-se seniority dated 30.05.2001 and 19.02.2004. Therefore, the

Hon'ble High Court came to the conclusion that Writ Petition belatedly filed in 2008 after a delay of seven years would not be maintainable but in the present OA, the seniority list has been revised by the State Government vide order dated 15.03.2013 on the basis of a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Thereafter the applicant has filed an OA No. 606/2013 on 26.08.2013 and thereafter the present OA has been on 19.11.2013. Thus the present OA is within limitation. Thus the question of limitation does not arise.

14. We have carefully given consideration to the rival submission of the parties on the point of limitation. We are inclined to agree with the arguments of the learned counsel for the applicant that the Writ Petition decided by the Hon'ble High Court in the case of **Kamlesh Kumar Sharma vs. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd. & Others** (supra) is not applicable under the fact & circumstances of the present OA. In the case before the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan (**Kamlesh Kumar Sharma vs. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd. & Others),** the seniority list was published on 30.05.2001 and another seniority list was issued on 29.05.2007. The Writ Petition was filed in the year 2008 challenging the seniority listed issued on 29.05.2007 whereas the Hon'ble High Court held that the seniority list issued on 29.05.2007 was merely reiteration of the inter-se seniority as already reflected in the final seniority list of the parties dated 30.05.2001 and 29.02.2004. Therefore, the Hon'ble High Court came to the conclusion that the Writ Petition

was belatedly filed in the year 2008 after a delay of seven year, which was not maintainable but in the present case, the State Government has revised the seniority list of the State Police Service Officers in the year 2013 on the basis of judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This fact has not been disputed either by the State Government or by the learned counsel for private respondents that the seniority list of the State Police Service Officers has been revised vide order dated 15.03.2013 (Annexure A/17). Thereafter the applicant filed the OA No. 606/2013 on 26.08.2013 which was disposed of vide order dated 04.09.2013 with the direction to the respondent no. 3 to dispose of the representation of the applicant within two months from the date of receipt of representation and comments thereon to the State Government of Rajasthan. In the meanwhile, the respondent no. 1 in an identical case of Mr. Rohit Mahajan passed an order dated 03.10.2013 where it was held that Review Selection Committee cannot be convened as there is no enabling provision in the Rules. In these circumstances, the applicant believing that the respondents are not expected to take a different view on the representation given by the applicant filed the present OA on 19.11.2013. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the OA cannot be dismissed on the ground of limitation. Accordingly the MA No. 297/00297/2014 filed by respondent no. 7 in regard to maintainability of the OA as per Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985 is dismissed.

15. The learned counsel for official respondents had also argued that the applicant has not challenged the provisions of Rule 5 of Indian Police Service (Appointment by Promotion) Regulation 1955 and Rule 3 of Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1988 and in the absence of challenge of these Rules/Regulations, the applicant is not entitled to any relief. The learned counsel for the applicant argued that he is neither challenging the Regulation with regard to promotion nor the Rules with regard to seniority, he is requesting for re-fixation of his seniority in accordance with the provision of the Regulation/Rules on the subject. We have given due consideration to the rival submission on this point and we are inclined to agree with the arguments of the learned counsel for the applicant that the prayer of the applicant is to grant seniority in the IPS on the basis of revised seniority in the State Police Service. He has not challenged provision either of Rule 5 of the Indian Police Service (Appointment by Promotion) Regulation 1955 or Rule 3 of Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1988. His simple prayer is that in the revised seniority list of the State Police Service Officers (RPS), the applicant has become senior to Shri Bal Mukund Verma, therefore in the IPS, his seniority should also be revised accordingly. He should be assigned seniority over Shri Bal Mukund Verma according to length of his service in the State Police Service (RPS).

16. With regard to the merits of the case, the facts are not disputed between the parties that Shri Bal Mukund Verma was senior to the applicant at the time when the select list was prepared in the year 2007-2008 but subsequently with the revised seniority list of the State Police Service Offices in the year 2013, the applicant became senior to Shri Bal Mukund Verma and hence the applicant is praying that in the IPS also, the applicant should be declared senior to Shri Bal Mukund Verma. The UPSC, Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs and State Government, all of them are of the view that since there is no enabling provision to conduct a Review DPC, therefore, the prayer of the applicant cannot be accepted unless there is an order of the Court. The official respondent no. 3, Ministry of Home Affairs, while deciding the representation of the application vide order dated 11.07.2014 in Para Nos. 12 & 13 has stated as under:-

> "12. Whereas, the Select Lists from 2001 onwards were prepared on the basis of the Seniority List prepared by the State Govt. with the assistance of Rule 8-A. Therefore, promotion to IPS made on the basis of said Select List were impacted due to above order of Hon'ble Apex Court and the Select Lists from 2001 to 2009 for promotion to IPS cadre of Uttar Pradesh were reviewed. That in case of Rajasthan there is no specific court direction to review any Select List for which seniority of eligible officers is revised with the retrospective effect, but after the Selects Lists were approved and acted upon.
>
> 13. Whereas, the Commission has informed that in absence of any enabling provision in the promotion regulations to review the Select Lists, the Commission cannot review such Select Lists unless there is specific direction for the same from a Court of law. There being no amendment in the Select Lists, this Ministry is not in a position to revise subsequent seniority of the applicants in the Indian Police Service."

17. From the perusal of Para No. 12, it is clear that Select List from 2001 to 2009 for promotion to IPS cadre of Uttar Pradesh were reviewed. That in the case of Rajasthan, there is no specific direction of a Court to review any Select List for which seniority of eligible officers is revised with retrospective effect. Similarly in Para No. 13, the Ministry of Home Affairs has stated that Commission informed that in absence of any enabling provision in the promotion regulations to review the Select Lists, the Commission cannot review such Select List unless there is specific direction for the same from a Court of law. The learned counsel for the applicant relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Amar Kant Choudhary vs. State of Bihar & Others** decided on 03.01.1984, 1984(1) SCC 694. In this case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed the State to reconsider and accord seniority and promotion to the petitioner with retrospective effect if selected to the IPS by promotion. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the ratio decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this case is squarely applicable under the facts & circumstances of the present OA. In the case before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the DPC relied upon the adverse entries of the petitioner which were expunged after Selection Committee had taken its decision. Subsequent favourable entries in confidential record were also not placed before the Committee. Representation given by the petitioner against non

inclusion in the select list was also not considered by the Committee in its next meeting. Thus a direction was issued to the State to reconsider the case of the petitioner. In this case, the applicants seniority in the State Police Service (RPS) has been revised by the State Government and the applicant has become senior to Shri Bal Mukund Verma in the State Police Service (RPS) due to the revision of the seniority. The select list for the year 2007-2008 was prepared on the basis of earlier seniority list in which Shri Bal Mukund Verma was senior to the applicant due to accelerated promotion being a ST candidate in the State Police Service (RPS) but after the revision of the seniority list of the RPS Officers, the applicant has become senior. Therefore, there is a need for a review DPC.

18. We agree with the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that the ratio decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Amar Kant Choudhary vs. State of Bihar & Others** (supra) is squarely applicable in the facts & circumstances of the present OA. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the principle of natural justice demands that when a State Police Service Officer has been declared senior to another State Police Service Officer then his inter-se seniority in the IPS is also required to be reconsidered, if both of them were promoted to IPS may be by way of a Review DPC. Therefore, we direct the official respondents to convene a Review DPC within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order on the basis of revised seniority

list issued by the State Government vide order dated 15.03.2013 (Annexure/17).

19. In the case of Rohit Mahajan vs. Union of India & Others (OA NO. 768/2013), the applicant is claiming seniority over Shri Vijendra Jhala and also Shri Ravi Kant Mittal. In the revised seniority list of State Police Service Officer (RPS), the applicant's seniority has been restored above Shri Vijendra Jhala and Shri Ravi Kant Mittal and, therefore, he has prayed that the applicant be assigned seniority above Shri Ravi Kant Mittal.

20. In the case of Veerbhan Ajwani vs. Union of India (OA No. 820/2013), the applicant is claiming seniority above Shri Bal Mukund Verma on the basis of revised seniority in the State Police Service Officers (RPS).

21. In the case of Hari Prasad Sharma vs. Union of India & Others (OA No. 291/00031/2014 with MA 291/00295/2014), the applicant is claiming seniority above Shri Bal Mukund Verma. Since we have already decided that the question of limitation does not arise, therefore, the MA No. 291/00295/2014 filed by respondent no. 7 stands dismissed.

22. In the case of Bahadur Singh Rathaur vs. Union of India & Others (OA No. 291/00032/2014 with MA 291/00296/2014), the applicant is claiming seniority above Shri Bal Mukund

Verma. Since we have already decided that the question of limitation does not arise, therefore, the MA No. 291/00296/2014 filed by respondent no. 8 stands dismissed.

23. The Registry is directed to place the copy of this order in the respective files.

(Anil Kumar)
Member (A)

(B.V.Rao)
Member (J)

Abdul