

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00230 of 2015
DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2018
HON'BLE SHRI DR.K.B.SURESH.... MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SHRI P.K. PRADHAN....MEMBER (A)

R. Rangashamaiah,
S/o Rangappa, aged 53 years,
Working as Office Assistant,
Aeronautical Development Establishment,
New Thippasandra Post,
Bengaluru - 560 075,
Residing at 'Babba Nivasam',
No. 189/A, BMP 31,
Narayanaswamy Layout,
Nagavarapalya, C.V. Raman Nagar Post,
Bengaluru- 560 093.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Shri A.R. Holla)
Vs.

1. The Union of India,
Represented by Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
Defence Research & Development Organisation,
Department of Posts,
New Delhi- 110 011.

2. The Scientific Advisor to Raksha Mantri,
Director General, DRDO,
Directorate of Personnel (RD/PERS-3),
DRDO Bhavan, R&D Head Quarters,
New Delhi- 110 011.

3. The Director,
Defence Research & Development Organisation,
Aeronautical Development Establishment,
C.V. Raman Nagar,
Bengaluru- 560 093.

4. Shri Bikrimjit Ghosh
Administrative Assistant 'A',
Office of the Director,
Aeronautical Development Establishment,
New Thippasandra Post,
Bengaluru- 560 075.

5. Shri M. Sathish,
Administrative Assistant 'A',
Office of the Director,
Aeronautical Development Establishment,
New Thippasandra Post,
Bengaluru- 560 075.

...Respondents

(By Shri M.V. Rao, Senior Panel Counsel)

O R D E R(ORAL)

HON'BLE DR K.B. SURESH, MEMBER(J)

Heard. The matter is covered by our order in OA.No. 300/2007 dated 28.07.2008. We hereby quote from the said order, so that the matter will be more clear.

“1. Heard Mr.B.Veerabhadra, learned Counsel appearing for the applicant. Mr.K.N.Chandrashekar, learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

2. This Original Application under Section 19 of Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 has been filed seeking for the following reliefs:

“(i) Call for relevant records leading to issuance of the impugned letter No.ADE/7511/18/PERS-Adm (CPC)/AWD dated 24.5.2007 (Annexure A-7) issued by the 1st respondent and letter in No.DOP/01/ADE/00011/M/01 dated 24.7.2007 issued by the 2nd respondent, which was communicated under letter No.ADE/7511/18/PERS-Adm(CPC)/AWD dated 3.8.2007 by the 1st respondent (Annexure A-10) and on perusal.

(ii)quash and set aside the the impugned letter No.ADE/7511/18/PERS-Adm (CPC)/AWD dated 24.5.2007 (Annexure A-7) issued by the 1st respondent and letter in No.DOP/01/ADE/00011/M/01 dated 24.7.2007 issued by the 2nd respondent, which was communicated under letter No.ADE/7511/18/PERS-Adm(CPC)/AWD dated 3.8.2007 by the 1st respondent (Annexure A-10) as arbitrary, discriminatory and void for the reasons stated herein while directing the respondents to comply with the DOP&T OM.NO.490011/1/96-Estt(C) dated 16.8.96 and grant the promotion from 22.12.2006 (the date from which the juniors to the applicant were promoted) and cause reversion of the junior, if necessary to accommodate the applicant as Admin Assistant 'A' and

(iii) Pass any other order or direction or grant any other relief as deemed fit by this Hon'ble Tribunal, in the interest of justice, equity and fairplay in administration.”

3. Today the learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel has produced before us a Memo for production of documents to clarify Government Order of DoP&T instructions dated 16.08.1996. These instructions are at Annexures R1 to R4 to this Memo. The learned Counsel submits that he has served a copy of the same on the learned Counsel for the applicant. When asked, Mr. B.Veerabhadra, learned Counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that in view of the clarification of the DoP&T instructions dated 16.08.1996, as produced by the respondents, the applicant has no more grievance and sought for a direction on the respondents to comply with the instructions of DoP&T, as mentioned above.

4. We, therefore, direct the respondents to comply with the instructions of the DoP&T, as stated above, within 2 months from the date of receipt of the copy of this Order.

5. With the above observation/direction the Original Application is disposed of. No order as to costs.”

2. By this order, we had disposed of the matter. Thereafter RA.No. 19/2008 was filed in the said OA.No.300/2007 and it was disposed of on 27.2.2013, which also we quote herein, as it will explain the factual issues, and the RA was rejected.

“1. This RA has been filed by the respondents 1-3 in OA.300/2007 under Section 22(3) (f) of the AT Act read with Rule 17 of the CAT Procedure Rules. We have heard learned counsel for the respective parties. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the observation made in the order at para 3 that the department has to comply with the directions of this Tribunal in accordance with DOP&T instructions dated 16.8.1996. The department wants a clarification by way of RA on this order. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that there is no ambiguity in the order. The

averments made in the Review application does not cover order 47 sub rule 1 of CPC.

2. We have carefully considered the submissions made by the respective parties and perused the order dated 28.7.2008 in the OA. 300/2007. As per para 3 of the impugned order, the respondents were directed to comply with the DOP&T instructions dated 16.8.1996 within 2 months from the date of receipt of that order. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that there are SRO 34 of 2006 and SRO 10E of 1998. DOPT instructions cannot override the rules framed under article 309 of the Constitution of India. The power to review under order 47 sub rule 1 of CPC is restricted, if any error apparent on the face of the record or clerical or arithmetical mistakes, those mistakes can be set right by way of review. In the present Review application we do not find any violation of the ingredients under order 47 sub rule 1 of CPC. Accordingly, we are not inclined to interfere in the impugned order. We apply the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of West Bengal & ors. vs. Kamal Sengupta and anr., reported in (2008) AIR SCW 4294.

3. For the foregoing reasons, we are of the view that there is no error apparent on the face of the record or clerical mistakes in the order dated 28.7.2008 in OA.300/2007. Accordingly, the RA is liable to be rejected.

4. Accordingly, RA is rejected. No order as to costs."

3. Thereafter, there was a Contempt Petition No. 70/2014 in OA.No.300/2007, which was taken up for hearing on 04.12.2014 and order was passed. We now quote that below, so for easy elucidation, in which we felt that the order had been complied with by saying that:

"This Contempt Petition (CP) has been filed by the applicant in OA 300/2007 alleging that the respondents in the said OA willfully

disobeyed the direction dated 28.07.2008 of this Tribunal. In the said order this Tribunal directed that:

Today the learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel has produced before us a Memo for production of documents to clarify Government Order of DoP&T instructions dated 16.08.1996. These instructions are at Annexures R1 to R4 to this Memo. The learned Counsel submits that he has served a copy of the same on the learned Counsel for the applicant. When asked, Mr. B.Veerabhadra, learned Counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that in view of the clarification of the DoP&T instructions dated 16.08.1996, as produced by the respondents, the applicant has no more grievance and sought for a direction on the respondents to comply with the instructions of DoP&T, as mentioned above.

We, therefore, direct the respondents to comply with the instructions of the DoP&T, as stated above, within 2 months from the date of receipt of the copy of this Order.

2. An RA No.19/2008 filed by the respondents in the said OA was also dismissed by this Tribunal on 27.02.2013 (Annexure C2). On 22.3.2013 and then again on 15.02.2014 the applicant in the OA addressed the Director, Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO), Bangalore, through his legal counsel, seeking promotion of the applicant to the cadre of LDC on par with his juniors (Annexure C3 and C4 respectively). In response, the first respondent in the OA in a letter dated 29.05.2014 (Annexure C5) informed the applicant that the department was awaiting the opinion of the Department of Personnel and Training (DOP&T) in this matter. Since the respondents have yet to comply with the direction of this Tribunal, the applicant has filed the present CP.

3. In the counter affidavit the respondents pleaded that the order of this Tribunal dated 03.04.2013 was forwarded to the 2nd respondent (Scientific Advisors in DRDO) and that the matter was now under consultation with DoP&T. They asserted that the respondents were trying their best to implement the order of this Tribunal and that there is no willful disobedience in the matter. It was also submitted that the petition itself is barred by limitation since it was filed one year after the cause of action.

4. In an affidavit dated 25.08.2014 the respondents have filed a compliance report enclosing a copy of a memorandum dated 11.09.2014 in which the applicant has been promoted to the post of Administrative Assistant-A with effect from 29.08.2014. The applicants have also filed a copy of a letter from the Union Department of Defence Research and Development, New Delhi, dated 29.08.2014, in which it is ordered that the applicant be appointed this post:

...in compliance with the Hon^{ble} Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), Bangalore order dated 29.07.2008 in OA No.300/2007 by relaxation of terms and conditions as stipulated in SRO 10E dated 29.05.1998 under rule 7 of said SRO read with provisions of DOP & T OM No.49011/96-Estt (C) dated 16.08.1996.

This issues with the concurrence of Ministry of Defence (Finance/R&D) vide their ID No.1067/Dir.Fin(R&D) dated 28.08.2014.

5. The letter dated 11.09.2014 also carries the following conditions;

The above promotion is subject to fulfilling the following conditions as stipulated in DOP&T OM No.40011/96-Estt (C) dated 16 Aug 1996:-

“Any person appointed as a Lower Division Clerk on the basis of qualifying examination should pass Typewriting Test within TWO years of his appointment, failing which he would be reverted to his earlier Group-D post. Until he passes the Typewriting Test within the time limit of TWO years, he will not be allowed to draw his increments. However, if he passes the Typing Test within six months of his initial appointment, his first increment will be granted after six months instead of one Year which will be absorbed in the subsequent regular increment”.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that this is necessary condition since it is in pursuance of OM No.40011/06-Estt (C) of the DOP&T dated 16.08.1996, a copy of which has also has been produced as Annexure R3.

7. We are satisfied that the order of this Tribunal has now been complied with and that there is no willful disobedience on the part of the respondents in OA 300/2007.

8. The CP is therefore closed. Notices are discharged.”

4. But by now it seems that the factual derivation is contrary to this had been taken in the reply statement in OA.No.230/2015. It is mentioned that in para 3 that there are 3 methodology of selection.

(1) By Direct Recruitment – 90%.

(2) By promotion on the basis of Selection-cum-seniority subject to qualifying the Limited Departmental Examination – 5%.

(3) By promotion on the basis of Selection -cum-seniority -5%.

5. There seems to be some distinction between clause 2 and 3, as stated above. One is on the basis of Limited Departmental Examination and the other on the basis of selection-cum-seniority. In all these, the word selection is used, which after having heard both counsel in detail, looked through the rules, seems to us, the only distinction is suitability barrier to be crossed, because no particular methodology is prescribed for the clause 3 at all, even though for clause 2 Limited Departmental Examination is postulated.

6. It is further explained by para 5 of the reply that the Board of Officers has invited all the 5 candidates for a Typing Test and Written Test on 07.11.2006. It is at this point divergence occurred from the Rules. The Rules canvas that within 2 years of appointment as LDC, the concerned employee has to pass the Typing Test. Here what has been contended contemporaneously that the written examination and Typing Test is also conducted, which is not canvassed under Rules. It is on this basis that all these legal misadventure took place. Apparently there was nobody to advice the Board of Officers that they are doing something irregular, because all these facts was clouded in all sort of other extraneous issues

as well. May be the judicial firmament also be devoid of this information and that is why the Hon'ble High Court had to send the matter back to review. Even though learned counsel for both sides agreed that this is covered by an earlier order, in the High Court the respondents took a view that this is not so covered and it made the High Court to believe and send the matter back to review. That is the reason why the matter which had commenced 11 years ago is still under consideration of various Courts. The respondents would say in para 8 (a) The DoPT OM No.49011/1/96-Estt(C) dated 16.08.1996 cannot have any over riding effect on the Statutory Rules (SRO 10E)(RR) issued in May 1998 in exercise of powers conferred by the proviso of Article 309 of the Constitution of India.

7. Thus the respondents have now challenged the statutory implication of DOPT OM and rightly or wrongly issued by the Government, where no one arm of governance can object. The delegation, rejection is stipulated under Article 309 of the Constitution is very germane to our issue. Personal ego of an officer may not have a role to play determining the integrity in governance. Let us now go to the 2nd clause, clause(b). The respondents say that the Recruitment Rules of May 1998 (as mentioned) have not been challenged in the OA nor have been quashed. Therefore the provisions thereof hold good.

8. We do not really understand what the respondents insist on, because in reply Government in their wisdom or not have taken steps to give certain exception to certain kind of employees and it may possibly be in contradiction and conflict any, with other Rules issued in connection with some other purpose Government has issued. But then it is to be understood with Article 309 is a transitory provision of the Constitution. It

was not meant to be in service after 7 decades of service. But then because of the great volumes in service jurisprudence and the difficulties and application of all arms of governance, the Government was unable to bring out a comprehensive service law as of now. But the question is, can it take away the right of the Government in the Ministry of Personnel to issue guidelines, which will be applicable to other arms of employment or other arms of governance, which is independent, is the question.

9. In para 8 of clause (c), it is stipulated by the respondents that the **Hon'ble CAT Bangalore has issued order merely on the basis of DOP&T OM dated 16.08.1996 ignoring the Statutory Rules (SRO 10E of 1998)(RR) which over ride the DOP&T guidelines that are administrative in nature.**

10. Therefore, what is the issue delegated by the legislation. Assuming that DOPT OM's are not issued on the basis of statutory formulations, can it be held by another department that its value stands diminished. The normal procedure ought to have been to appraise the DOPT of the conflict, if at all there is a conflict. No Government department is entitled to and eligible to take independent decision as they are not independent in all matters. Personal supremacy of DOPT is accepted and acknowledged. Therefore, we think that there is something wrong in Board of Officers doing this. Thereafter the respondents in para 11 say that:

“The opinion of DOPT to implement the said order of Hon'ble Tribunal was received on 30.07.2014 and 29.08.2014 to appoint the applicant herein to the post of Admin. Assistant 'A' in compliance with the Hon'ble CAT, Bangalore order dated 28.07.2008 in OA.No.300/2007 by relaxation of terms & conditions as stipulated in SRO 10E (RR) dated 29.05.1998 under Rule 7 of said SRO read with provisions of DOPT OM No.49011/96-Estt(C) dated 16.08.1996, was issued a Memo bearing No.

ADE/7528/PA(CPC)/ AWD/DPC-III dated 11.09.2014 appointing him as Admin. Assistant 'A' w.e.f. 29.08.2014 subject to the conditions mentioned in DOPT OM No.40011/96-Estt(C) dated 16.08.1996.”

11. By this the order was complied technically. But then the order was to appoint the applicant in co-relation with his juniors if the applicant had, so entitled. The DOPT clarification was, as given by the respondents, it clarified this point and personal sanction was also given. Thereupon the respondents had a duty to post the applicant to the post with effect from the earliest point to which it is available to him, i.e. , the date the juniors were promoted. But we find with some regret that at this point of time the respondents are adopting the attitude of one man-ship. Thereafter the matter came up and we had examined the matter once again when we had passed an order as follows, in this matter:

“OA.No.230/2015

“The matter seems to be covered by our order in OA.No. 300/2007 dated 28.07.2008 and both sides agree that the matter is similar. Therefore, this OA is allowed in terms of earlier OA mentioned above. Benefits may be made available to the applicant from the date his juniors are promoted. This may be done within 2 months next. OA is allowed. No order as to costs.”

12. What happened at this juncture, both counsel agree that it is already covered by the issue settled by the order in OA.No. 300/2007 dated 28.7.2008, as both side had agreed that the matter is similar. But then thereafter the respondents approached the Hon'ble High Court with the contention that in fact they are not agreeing that the matters are similar. They would say in the High Court that in fact matters are not similar. But in the interregnum, the respondents has at least pretended

that they are going to implement the order, while agitating the matter in the High Court itself. We had actually granted extension of time to implement the order vide order in MA.No.84/2016 dated 24.2.2016, which we quote below:

“Heard the matter. Two months time is allowed to implement the order in OA.No.230/2015. MA for extension of time is allowed. No order as to costs.”

13. Thereafter also the respondents had taken some more time to implement the order while they were actually pursuing the Writ Petition in the High Court and in MA.No.217/2016 we had granted one more extension to implement the order, which we now quote below:--

“Heard. MA for extension of time is allowed. Two months granted to comply with the order in OA.No.170/00230/2015 dated 14.12.2015. No order as to costs.”

14. Therefore, we are surprised to find that a Writ Petition was filed before the Hon'ble High Court as WP.No.37319/2016, which was disposed of by order dated 18.01.2017, which we quote below:

“The present petition is directed against the order dated 14.12.2015 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as the Tribunal for the sake of brevity), whereby the Tribunal has directed the respondents therein-petitioners herein to extend the benefit on promotion from the date on which the juniors were granted promotion.

2. We have heard Mr.H.Jayakara Shetty, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioners and Mr.A.R.Holla, learned Counsel appearing for respondent No.1.

3. It appears that there is a statement recorded by the Tribunal as under:

“The matter seems to be covered by our order in OA No.300/2007 dated 28.07.2008 and both sides agree that the matter is similar.”

4. When we further enquired from the learned Counsel for the petitioners as well as for respondent No.1, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that what was directed in the earlier order dated 28.07.2008 in O.A.No.300/2007 was for the instruction dated 16.08.1996 of Department of Personnel and Training (for short ‘DoP&T’).

5. Per contra, learned Counsel for respondent No.1 submits that the instructions of DoPT was not only dated 16.08.1996, but it included the other instructions produced at Annexures ‘R1’ to ‘R4’ with the memo. The learned Counsel for respondent No.1 further submits that the instruction at Annexures ‘R1’ to ‘R4’ included the instruction dated 29.09.1992 for exemption. Whereas, the learned Counsel for the petitioners does not admit the same.

6. Under the circumstances, we find that when the Tribunal was made to believe that the matter is covered by the earlier order dated 28.07.2008, but if the petitioners contend that it is not covered, it would be appropriate for the petitioners to file review application before the Tribunal seeking clarification and the Tribunal may examine the contentions of the party on merit. At this stage, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that if it is so directed by this Court, review application will be preferred, but the interim relief granted earlier be continued for some time to enable the petitioners to approach before the Tribunal.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, we find that if the review application is preferred by the petitioners within a period of four weeks from today, the interim relief granted earlier shall continue for a period of eight weeks. In the meantime, it would be open to the petitioners to file interim stay application which shall

be considered by the Tribunal in accordance with law. The Tribunal shall pass the order below the review application at the earliest.

8. Writ petition is disposed of accordingly.”

15. Apparently it was posted before the Hon'ble High Court, as mentioned in para 4 of the said judgement that: “When we further enquired from the learned Counsel for the petitioners as well as for respondent No.1, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that what was directed in the earlier order dated 28.07.2008 in O.A.No.300/2007 was for the instruction dated 16.08.1996 of Department of Personnel and Training (for short ‘DoP&T’).”

16. Now we fail to find what is the clarification that is required and RA.18/2017 was filed, which was allowed with an agreement that we will take up the matter once again. At this point of time, learned counsel for the applicant places before us an OM, Gl., Dept. of Per. & Trg., OM.No.F.No.14020/1/2014-Estt.(D), dated 22.4.2015, Instructions:-

“Gl. Dept.of Per. & Trg., O.M.No. F.No. 14020/ 1 /2014-Estt. (D)
dated 22.4.2015

Instructions on exemption from passing the Typewriting Test on Computer in respect of LDCs, regarding.

The undersigned is directed to say that instructions issued by this Department vide O.M.No.14020/2/91-Estt(D) dated 29th September, 1992 provide for grant of exemption from passing the typing test for drawal of increments and confirmation in respect of LDCs.

2(i) . The above mentioned instructions provide for exemptions as under:-

a)If above 45 years of age on the date of their appointment, such persons may be granted exemption from the date of their appointment.

b) If between the age of 35 years and 45 years at the time of their appointment, such persons may be granted exemption on attaining the age of 45 years.

c) If below 35 years of age on the date of appointment, such persons may be given exemption after 10 years of service as LDC provided they have made two genuine attempts to pass the typing test; otherwise they may be granted exemption after attaining the age of 45 years.

d) Those LDCs who have made two genuine attempts for passing the typing test prior to issue of this O M but have not completed 8 years service as LDC, may be granted exemption from passing the typing test after completion of 8 years of service or on attaining the age of 45 years, whichever is earlier.

(ii) For the Physically handicapped persons, these instructions provide for exemptions as under:-

a) Physically handicapped persons who are otherwise qualified to hold clerical post and who are certified as being unable to type by the Medical Board attached to Special Employment Exchanges for the Handicapped (or by a Civil Surgeon where there is no such Board) may be exempted from passing the typing test.

b) The term 'physically handicapped persons' does not cover those who are visually handicapped or who are hearing handicapped but cover only those whose physical disability permanently prevents them from typing.

3. Model RRs for the post of Lower Division Clerk (LDC) were issued vide this Department's O.M.No.AB-14017/32/2009-Estt(RR) dated 7th October, 2009. The entries pertaining to Skill Test Norms prescribed in the Col. 8 of the Model RRs for the post of LDC were modified to include the Skill Test Norms 'only on computers' vide this Department's O.M.No.AB- 14017/32/2009-Estt(RR) dated 17 May, 2010.
4. This Department has received references whether the instructions as contained in this Department's OM dated 29.9.1992 are applicable for test on Computer or not. The matter has been examined and it has been decided that the criteria for grant of exemption from passing the typing test in respect of such LDCs including Physically Handicapped persons/Persons with Disabilities as stipulated in this Department's O.M.No.14020/2/91-Estt(D) dated 29th September, 1992 would also be applicable to the test on Computers.
5. It has also been decided to extend the above instructions to Sportspersons recruited against Sports quota under the Scheme of appointment of meritorious Sportspersons."

17. Therefore, 2 elements of consideration has now been clear by DOPT instructions.

(1) The respondents went wrong in thinking that there must be contemporaneously Typing Test along with written examination, when rules which pertain at that point of time had stipulated that there can be a Typing Test under the rules within 2 years of such appointment as LDC. But apparently either on wrong advice or wrong understanding of the matter, the respondents have taken a view that it has to be contemporaneous with the selection and not thereafter. This stand taken by the respondents is obviously wrong as it is clear from the mere reading of the rules.

(2) DOPT consistently held that persons who are above 45 years, need not pass the Typing Test at all. This also should have a bearing in the minds of the respondents, even though they claim that their Recruitment Rules which was enacted in 1998 must have precedence over Department of Personnel Ruling. Governance of country cannot be carried in such fragmented manner, if each of the departments are taking conflicting and contrary views and Government will come to a stand still. Therefore, we regret to note that a total frivolous and vexatious view had been taken by the respondents in this matter and had paved way for this matter to be pending for the last nearly 12 years now.

18. Therefore, we hold and declare that the applicant need not pass the Typing Test as held by the DOPT, which is the prime agency for employees pertaining to service issues in Government of India, in terms of which the applicant will be held to be eligible for promotion on the date on which his juniors were actually promoted as mentioned in the earlier stipulation and be eligible for financial and other benefits along with an interest at the rate of 15% as held by the Hon'ble High Court in other cases.

19. In view of the frivolous and vexatious stand taken by the respondents, the OA is allowed with a cost of Rs. One Lakh. There is no need for people of the land to loose this money and an internal enquiry will be held to find out who is responsible for this and this money along with the standard interest recovered from the persons who are guilty of such infraction.

20. OA allowed with a cost of Rs. One Lakh.

(P.K. PRADHAN)
MEMBER(A)

(DR. K.B.SURESH)
MEMBER(J)

vmr.

Annexures referred to by the Applicant in OA.No.230/2015.

Annexure A-1: Copy of the Notification dated 25.09.2006.

Annexure A-2: Copy of the Memo dated 22.12.2006.

Annexure A-3: Copy of the Memo dated 22.12.2006.

Annexure A-4: Copy of the Seniority List dated Nil.

Annexure A-5: Copy of applicant's representation dated 22.03.2007.

Annexure A-6: Copy of the letter dated 24.07.2007.

Annexure A-7: Copy of applicant's representation dated 28.06.2007.

Annexure A-8: Copy of the O.M. dated 16.08.1996.

Annexure A-9: Copy of the order dated 28.07.2008.

Annexure A-10: Copy of the order dated 27.02.2013 in RA.No. 19/2008.

Annexure A-11: Copy of the order dated 04.12.2014 in CP.No. 70/2014.

Annexure A-12: Copy of the memo dated 11.09.2014.

Annexure A-13: Copy of the Seniority List dated Nil.

Annexures referred to in the rejoinder.

Annexure R-14: Copy of the O.M. dated 14.09.1995 & O.M. Dated 29.09.1992.

Annexures referred to in MA.No.84/2016.

Annexure MA-1: Copy of the order dated 14.12.2015 in OA.No. 230/2015.

Annexures referred to in MA.No.217/2016.

Annexure MA-1: Copy of the order dated 14.12.2015 in OA.No. 230/2015.

Annexure MA-2: Copy of the order dated 24.02.2016 in MA.No. 84/2016.

.....

