

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00834/2016

DATED THIS THE 08th DAY OF JANUARY, 2019

HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Mr. S S Nandisha
 S/o B M Shankarappa
 Aged about 63 years
 Residing at No.6/30-3
 Shankar Nilaya
 9th Cross 4th Main
 Chamarajpet
 Bangalore-560 018.

....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri H.K.S.Holla)

Vs.

1. The Central Provident Fund Commissioner
 Bhavishyanidhi Bhavan
 14 Bhikaji Cama Place
 New Delhi-110 066.
2. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner
 Employees Provident Fund Organisation
 Bhavishyanidhi Bhavan
 No.13, Raja Ram Mohan Roy Road
 Bangalore-560 025.

...Respondents

(By Advocates Sri G.Mallikarjunappa & Shri Dinesh S Kadlass)

ORDER

(PER HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, MEMBER (ADMN))

The applicant has filed the present OA seeking the following relief:

“Issue a direction to respondents to notional promotion of the applicant from the date on which he was eligible for promotion to the post of Assistant Director (Information Service) against the sanctioned vacancies and notional fixing his pay and take up his consideration for pension w.e.f. 01.08.2013 on the date on which the applicant retired from service.”

2. The applicant in the present case was appointed to the post of LDC in the respondent organisation on 06.05.1976 and subsequently he was promoted to

the post of Assistant Director (Information Services) [AD(IS)] in the respondent organisation in the pay scale of Rs.8000-13500 vide promotion order dtd.1.12.2009(Annexure-A1). He submits that the respondent organisation while restructuring the information service ranking in the employees organisation decided to create the additional post of Assistant Director (Information Service) as per the minutes of 65th Central Board of Trustees meeting held on 22.02.2009(Annexure-A2). In pursuance of decision taken by Central Board of Trustees, the respondents framed the rules with regard to appointment of Assistant Director (Information Service)(Annexure-A3). As per the DOPT circular instructions conveyed by the Employees Provident Fund Organisation vide dtd.21.03.2013(Annexure-A4) vide para 3, it clearly indicates that 'under no circumstances the DPCs are to be delayed to avoid frustration among the eligible candidates. The applicant submits that there was delay in issuing promotion order, therefore he gave a representation dtd.27.2.2013(Annexure-A5) requesting respondents to consider the fixation of notional seniority in the post of Assistant Director(Information Service). He has also submitted another representation dtd.25.3.2013(Annexure-A6) requesting respondents to consider the fixation of notional seniority and subsequent promotion in the post. In reply to the same, the 1st and 2nd respondents have sent office note dtd.17.5.2013(Annexure-A7) and 29.5.2013(Annexure-A8) stating that the applicant's regularization cannot be pre-poned and advanced at this stage. Applicant submits that as there was no proper response from the respondents, he filed an application dtd.7.10.2013(Annexure-A9) under RTI Act. The respondent No.1 by its reply dtd.6.11.2013(Annexure-A10) stated that there is no material information available on record for circumstances causing the delay for holding the DPC for more than 8 months.

3. The applicant submits that as the respondents failed to take any action in pursuance of various representations, he made RTI appeals dtd.13.8.2014, 22.8.2014, 24.9.2014, 6.4.2015, 25.10.2014, 9.10.2014, 29.10.2014, 18.2.2015, 6.4.2015, 13.3.2015, 13.11.2014, 17.6.2016 and 20.6.2016(Annexures-A11 to A23). The posts of AD(IS) were notified during February, 2009 itself as per the decision taken in 65th CBT Executive Committee meeting and the DPC was not held till November 2009. And hence there was a delay of 8 months, due to which he was deprived of getting the benefit of senior time scale. He had completed 3 years 9 months as AD(IS) on the date of his retirement on 31.7.2013. Had he completed 4 years in this cadre, he could have got the senior time scale benefit. The delay caused by the department in promoting him has caused considerable loss to him. As per the circular issued by the DOPT, it is evident that DPC should be held in the regular intervals to draw the panels and promote the deserving officers of the higher post. Unfortunately, the respondents have failed to adhere to this direction, as a result of which the applicant was prevented from appointment to the post of AD(IS) from the date on which the respondents created the post and lost all consequential benefits such as promotion to the higher post and fixation of salary in the next higher post. Aggrieved by the inaction of the respondents, he has filed the present OA seeking the relief as stated above.
4. The respondents have filed reply statement wherein they submit that the applicant joined the services of Employees' Provident Fund Organization(EPFO), Ministry of Labour and Employment, Govt. of India, Regional Office, Bengaluru as Lower Division Clerk w.e.f. 6.5.1976. After rendering considerable stretch of service, he got promoted to the post of UDC w.e.f. 18.11.1978 and to the post of Head Clerk/Section Supervisor w.e.f.

27.10.1998. They submit that vide notification dtd.5.12.1997, they called for applications for the post of Programmer in the EPFO on deputation from amongst the officers of EPFO and under the Central Govt./State Govt. etc. In response to the same, the applicant vide application dtd.22.12.1997 has applied for the post of Programmer and the same could not be considered due to shortfall in meeting the requirements. However, he was considered for the post of Assistant Programmer and was issued with offer of appointment to that post vide order dtd.26.10.1998 and on acceptance, he has reported for duty on 30.11.1998 at Regional office, Mangalore. While working as such, he submitted a representation dtd.12.5.2000 seeking transfer from Mangalore to Bengaluru/Mysore. The respondents after considering his plea had transferred and posted him at Bengaluru w.e.f. 5.2.2001. He continued to serve in that post up to November, 2005.

5. The respondents further submit that based on the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee(DPC) which met on 17.11.2005, the competent authority was pleased to approve the promotion of the applicant from the post of assistant Programmer to the post of Programmer on regular basis vide order dtd.10.2.2006. The applicant reported for duty to the said post w.e.f. 10.2.2006. At the time of notification of the recruitment rules for the post of Assistant Director(Information Services) [AD(IS)] which has been sanctioned in the organisation in Group 'A' level to be filled by the method of promotion for which 25% of the posts earmarked failing which to be filled by deputation for which 75% posts were earmarked vide recruitment rules at Annexure-R1, the applicant was working as Assistant Programmer. As per the recruitment rules for the post of AD(IS), a person in the feeder post of Programmer should have rendered two years of regular service in the grade to be eligible for promotion. The applicant was promoted to the post of

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench

Programmer only on 17.11.2005 vide order dtd.10.2.2006(Annexure-R2) as per his eligibility in the lower post of Assistant Programmer. In response to Memorandum dtd.16.1.2001, the applicant has applied for the post of AD(IS) vide application dtd.31.1.2001. That out of 17 posts available for the post of AD(IS) in 2001, only 4 posts were available to be filled by promotion from the feeder post of Programmer, but the applicant was not holding that post on the date of notification of recruitment rules. As the applicant has not met the mandatory requirement i.e. rendering two years' regular service in the cadre of Programmer and was holding the post of Assistant Programmer, the respondents did not consider his application for the post of AD(IS).

6. The respondents further submitted that in order to meet the administrative requirement and also to improve the promotion avenues, the Dept. had created additional posts for the Information Services Wing of the Organisation. With creation of additional posts, the existing provisions of the method of recruitment in the recruitment rules were also approved for amendment. The recruitment rules were amended making provision for 60% posts to be earmarked for promotion from the feeder posts on seniority cum-fitness and 40% of the posts were to be earmarked to be filled on deputation. The amendment to the recruitment rules(Annexure-R3) for the post of AD(IS) were notified on 4.4.2009 and thereafter action was initiated to fill up the posts. The applicant was Assistant Programmer on the date of notification of the earlier recruitment rules. Thereafter, he was promoted to the post of Programmer w.e.f. 17.11.2005. As per the seniority list of regular Programmers as on 31.3.2007(Annexure-R4), the applicant is placed at Sl.No.15. As there were only 17 AD(IS) posts sanctioned in the department out of which only 4 posts were earmarked for promotion, the applicant had no chance for consideration for promotion as there were 14 officers senior to him

in the list of Programmers. Consequent on promotion to the post of AD(IS) vide order dtd.1.12.2009, the applicant was appointed on regular basis w.e.f. 1.12.2009. On the contention of the applicant that due to delay of eight months in holding DPC meeting for the post of AD(IS), he was prevented from appointment to the said post from the date on which the respondents created the post thereby he had completed only 3 years and 9 months on the date of his retirement which caused considerable loss to him, the respondents submit that the amendment of Recruitment Rules for the post of AD(IS) whereby the promotional avenue of the applicant/similarly placed officials has paved way for advancement in career, were notified w.e.f. 4.4.2009 and the DPC was conducted on 13.11.2009 and the applicant was promoted on 01.12.2009 i.e. immediately after holding of DPC. Hence, there is no delay as contended by the applicant. The submission of the applicant that the DOPT instructions were not followed by the department and there was delay of 8 months in holding the DPC is not tenable and justified as the department had itself taken action to amend the recruitment rules to increase the promotion quota and created sufficient number of posts for promotion from the feeder post of Programmer w.e.f. 4.4.2009 and thereafter DPC was held on 13.11.2009 and on its recommendation, the applicant along with 12 other officers were appointed to AD(IS) vide order dtd.1.12.2009(Annexure-R5). As per DOPT instructions, the DPC has to be conducted between January to March and these instructions are applicable in respect of vacancies arising out of existing sanction of that particular cadre. In the instant case, the additional posts of AD(IS) created by the Board came into operation with the notification dtd.4.4.2009. Therefore, the DPC could not have been conducted prior to April 2009. It is only through the amendment of recruitment rules, the applicant got promotion to the post of AD(IS) w.e.f. 1.12.2009 and the

changed circumstances have proven advantageous to the applicant. Hence, the averment of the applicant that the additional posts of AD(IS) were created w.e.f. 22.2.2009 is unfounded and without merits and his plea to consider fixation of notional seniority is also not justifiable. Hence, on this ground itself, the OA deserves to be dismissed as the applicant is mis-representing the facts.

7. The claim of the applicant for pre-ponement of promotion is untenable on the ground that absolute right is not conferred upon the applicant for grant of promotion to the post of AD(IS) as promotional avenues is preceded with fulfilling of mandatory requirement such as clearance from vigilance angle/availability of vacancy etc. The High Court of Delhi in its order dtd.28.2.2012 in *WP(C).No.5549/2007 in the case of Dr.Sahadeva Singh* has observed that 'it is true that filling up of the posts are for clear or anticipated vacancies arising in the year. It is settled law that mere inclusion of one's name in the list does not confer any right in him/her to appointment. It is not incumbent that all posts may be filled up. But the authority must act reasonably, fairly and in public interest and omission thereof should not be arbitrary.' Thus the respondent organisation in all fairness has filled the vacancies of AD(IS) created on 1.4.2009 by the month end of November 2009 and action of respondents manifest in itself that within reasonable time the process of recruitment by promotion has been duly completed and hence the claim of the applicant is stale and irrational and the date of promotion cannot be pre-poned.
8. The applicant has filed rejoinder wherein he submits that the transfer of the applicant to the Regional Office Bangalore was done during the deputation period of the applicant at RO, Bangalore and he never applied for his transfer

from Mangalore to the Regional Office, Bangalore. He further submits that the Head Office has issued the memorandum dtd.16.1.2001 to fill the posts of AD(IS) on deputation basis and not on promotional basis. The applicant had never applied for the post of AD(IS) on promotion basis as stated by the respondents. As he was eligible to apply for the post on deputation basis, the applicant had applied for the post but he was not selected to the said post. The applicant is not asking for his promotion to the said post as on 9.6.2001. The applicant was eligible for promotion to the post of AD(IS) w.e.f. 1.4.2009 on which the creation of additional posts were conveyed and there was no hurdle to promote him when he became eligible against the posts available. But the respondent organisation delayed the matter without any justification and only on 13.11.2009, the respondents held DPC and issued promotion order on 1.12.2009 causing delay of more than 8 months without any valid reason. There were 14 posts fall under the category to be filled by way of promotion, even before the issue of the amended recruitment rules on 4.4.2009. The statement of the respondents that there were only 17 posts to be filled is without any basis. He is only seeking promotion from the date of his eligibility and vacant posts were available on 1.4.2009 and not prior to that. Before the amended recruitment rules of the AD(IS) i.e. prior to 4.4.2009, the total posts available including the additional posts was 56. As per the earlier rules, the percentage of posts to be filled by way of promotion is 25% of the total posts. That means, out of 56 posts available, 25% will be 14 posts which have to be filled by way of promotion. The applicant was covered among these 14 posts as per the finalised seniority list of Programmers. Had the respondents taken action to fill these 14 posts, the applicant would have got the promotion. Hence, the statement of the respondents that the applicant was not eligible for promotion under the earlier recruitment rules is wrong and

misleading. Even after the notification of the amended recruitment rules on 4.4.2009, the respondents have not taken immediate action to hold the DPC and caused delay for more than 8 months to hold DPC on 13.11.2009 and the promotion order was issued on 1.12.2009. There was no hurdle for holding of DPC immediately after the vacancies are notified. The applicant was eligible for the post of AD(IS) as on 1.4.2009 under the earlier recruitment rules also, consequent on the creation of the additional posts. The statement of the respondents that the additional posts of AD(IS) came into operation w.e.f. 4.4.2009 is baseless and misleading. The notification dtd.4.4.2009 was issued only to amend the percentage of promotion quota and not for the operation of the additional posts. The respondents have suppressed the fact of the office order dtd.1.4.2009 conveying the approval of the Central board dtd.22.2.2009 in creating the additional posts of AD(IS) and thereby increased the total strength to 56 from 17. The amended recruitment rule notification is nothing to do with the operation of the additional posts, since the additional posts were already in operation with the office order dtd.1.4.2009.

9. The respondents have filed reply to the rejoinder contending that the applicant has failed to note that he has submitted representations dtd.28.4.1999(Annexure-R6), 12.5.2000(Annexure-R7), 30.8.2000 (Annexure-R8) and 1.1.2001(Annexure-R9) for transfer from Regional Office Mangalore to Bengaluru saying that his spouse is employed in Postal department and family members are residing at Bengaluru. While considering the plea of the applicant, the respondents have issued transfer order dtd.5.2.2001(Annexure-R10) wherein it is stated that the said transfer was caused not on the thrust of the public interest rather it was made at the request of the applicant.

10. They further submitted that owing to amendment of recruitment rules w.e.f.

4.4.2009, the respondent had set in motion for constitution of DPC and the DPC had recommended for promotion of the applicant/similarly placed officers to the post of AD(IS) w.e.f. 13.11.2009. The spillover time of eight months i.e. from 4.4.2009 (date of Gazette) to 13.11.2009(to conduct of DPC) is squarely due to administrative reasons and also rest on administrative requirements such as verification of confidential reports, call for vigilance clearance etc. Mere availability of vacancies/posts would not entitle the applicant for claiming the promotional post w.e.f. 4.4.2009 in the absence of recommendation of DPC reflecting the suitability of applicant/similarly placed officers and considering such claim would only lead to administrative fallacy. The Central Board of Trustees, Executive Committee, E.P.F in its meeting dtd.22.2.2009 has approved the creation of additional posts of AD(IS) and amendment in recruitment rules w.e.f 4.4.2009 for the said posts has paved way for initiation of recruitment process. Prior to amendment of recruitment rules, the applicant was not entitled for consideration to the post of AD(IS) and owing to change in earmarking of vacancies under the modes of promotion and deputation had proven to be advantageous to the applicant and more so, the officers who are senior to applicant were also granted promotion w.e.f. 13.11.2009 by adhering to administrative procedure. The claim of applicant for grant of promotion w.e.f. 4.4.2009 is unjustifiable and no right is vested upon him for raising such claim and hence he is precluded from questioning the mode of appointment. The applicant has failed to note that with creation of additional posts of AD(IS) and amendment of recruitment rules w.e.f. 4.4.2009, the respondents have completed the process of recruitment of promotion by November, 2009. The consumption of time is well within the parameter/time frame of DOPT guidelines, i.e. modal calendar OM dtd.08.09.1998 and 13.10.1998 and as such the claim of the applicant i.e. delay of eight months is extraneous and

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench

falls to ground. The applicant all along asserts that he is entitled for promotion to the post of AD(IS) w.e.f. 4.4.2009 without noticing the fact, as on that date, though there was approval of the Central Board of Trustees, EPF for creation of additional posts, the process of constitution of DPC and its eventual recommendation has yet to reach its finality. The applicant's claim for promotion w.e.f. 4.4.2009 in the absence of due recommendation of DPC is bewildering and frivolous without proper appreciation of rule position and administrative procedure.

11. The applicant has filed additional rejoinder reiterating the submissions already made in the OA and submits that the matter relating to the transfer of the applicant from Mangalore to Bangalore during 2001 is not at all a subject in the application and he had never requested for his transfer from the Mangalore to the Regional Office, Bengaluru. None of the Annexures from R6 to R9 indicates his request for transfer to Regional Office, Bengaluru and the transfer order dtd.5.2.2001 is not as per the requests made by the applicant. The statement of the respondents that the spillover time of eight months to conduct DPC is squarely due to administrative reasons and also rest on administrative requirements such as verification of confidential reports, call for vigilance clearance etc. is not in accordance with the DOPT circular dtd.8.9.1998. It cannot be accepted in view of the DOPT circular that all the administrative requirements should be completed in advance before the commencement of the vacancy year and to see that the panel of eligible candidates is ready in the beginning of the vacancy year. The DOPT has prescribed a time schedule for convening DPCs not only in time but in advance also so as to utilize the prepared panel as and when the vacancies arise during the course of the vacancy year. The DOPT has issued several circular instructions reiterating the adhering of the Model Calendar prescribed

for conduct of the DPCs in the above said circular dtd.8.9.1998. Some of the DOPT circulars are filed as Annexures-A23 to 29 which clearly stress on the compliance of the model calendar and it is obligatory for the respondents to adhere to the time schedule laid down by the DOPT for making promotions against the vacancies occurring during the course of a year. The OM issued by DOPT enjoined upon the respondents to initiate action, in advance, to fill up the vacancies arisen during the course of the vacancy year and not taking their own time to meet the administrative requirements after the vacancies arise. The Central PF Commissioner, who is the head of the respondent organisation has clearly accepted the fact in para-1 of their letter marked as Annexure-A4 that the DOPT circular instructions are not adhered to in holding the timely DPCs and reiterated the instructions of the DOPT circular dtd.8.9.1998. There is a failure on the part of the respondents in not adhering to the instructions of the DOPT in the applicant's delayed promotion also as accepted by them. There is no material information available on records with them with regard to the circumstances causing the delay for holding the DPC for more than 8 months and not following the DOPT instructions. There is no rule to support the administrative delay as claimed by the respondents. The order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP.No.561/2003 dtd.3.5.2012(Annexure-A29) also says that 'there would be no justification for making the employee suffer merely on account of inaction or delay on the part of the department for not convening the DPC and postpone the promotion till the DPC actually met.' The respondents in their letter dtd.9.5.2017(Annexure-A30) have stated that as on 1.4.2009, there are 29 posts to be filled by promotion and the eligible programmers who had rendered regular service of 3 years as on 1.1.2009 were considered for promotion in the DPC meeting held on 13.11.2009. The applicant was entitled for promotion to the post of

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench

AD(IS) as on 1.4.2009 itself i.e. prior to the amendment of recruitment rules.

The failure on the part of the respondents in not holding the DPC as per the modal calendar resulted in the delayed promotion and the applicant is justified in demanding his promotion from the date of his eligibility i.e. from 1.4.2009 in accordance with the recruitment rules existing as on that date.

12.The respondent organisation has taken quicker action in the case of promotion of the Additional Central PF Commissioners during the same vacancy year 2009. Though the administrative procedure in these cases is complicated, the respondents have promoted the eligible candidates immediately after the posts were created during February 2009 itself on adhoc basis followed by their regularization by April 2009 i.e. within 2 months. Whereas, they have taken more than 8 months to conduct DPC in the case of AD(IS) during the same vacancy year 2009. The disparity shown is liable to be questioned by the affected persons. The one rule position is applicable to all the cadres in the same organization. Though the applicant has no vested right for promotion, but the respondents cannot act arbitrarily and without any reasonable excuse defer the meeting of DPC and thereby deprive the applicant of his legitimate expectations for being considered for promotion to the post of AD(IS) which he is eligible w.e.f. 1.4.2009.

13.The respondents have filed reply to the additional rejoinder filed by the applicant wherein they submit that the applicant without limiting his stance based on the documents annexed with the application has attempted to bring in piecemeal information and new document dtd.9.5.2017(Annexure-A30) which obtained under RTI act which is untenable. The applicant, on the one hand has filed this application and on the other obtained the information/data from public authorities consequent to filing of application which is not

admissible at this stage as being an endless process on the part of the applicant. Further, the applicant referred to case of promotion of the Additional Central PF Commissioner during the same vacancy year 2009 in a trivial manner without understanding the fact that promotion to the posts of AD(IS) and that Additional Central PF Commissioner rests on various factors such as vacancy position, administrative requirements etc. The attempt of applicant in making comparison of these two promotional aspects is irrelevant and out of context.

14. The respondents have also filed written arguments note wherein they submit that on acceptance of promotion during December, 2009, the applicant remained dormant till his retirement i.e. in July 2013 and he raised his claim through the instant applicant during September 2016 which is time barred as also devoid of merit. In response to it, the applicant has filed MA.57/2018 for condonation of delay of 3 years and 13 days in filing the OA. He also filed reply to the written argument note of the respondents reiterating the submission made in the OA, rejoinder and additional rejoinder enclosing therewith various Supreme Court decisions in support of his contention.

15. We have heard the Learned Counsel for the parties. The Learned Counsels for the applicant and the respondents have made submissions reiterating the factual position and their points as highlighted by them in the OA , reply statements, rejoinder, additional rejoinder and additional reply statement.

16. We have gone through the main contentions of the applicant and replies of the respondents in detail. The applicant has raised two main contentions. The first one being that even before the revised recruitment rules being notified on 04.04.2009, as on 01.04.2009 itself he was eligible to be promoted as Assistant Director(IS) based on the then existing rules. The second contention

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench

relates to delay in convening the DPC on 13.11.2009 even though the rules were notified as early as 04.04.2009. Regarding the first contention, as can we see from Annexure-R4, the seniority list of Programmers eligible to be promoted as Assistant Director(IS) as on 31.03.2007 contains the names of 15 persons with the applicant being SI.No.15. Serial No.1 in the list is noted as 'already promoted as Assistant Director(IS) on regular basis' and SI.No.14 is stated to have resigned on 07.05.2007 leaving the list with 13 persons who were eligible to be promoted as on 01.04.2009 as claimed by the applicant. The applicant has got information as at Annexure-A30 regarding the number of posts which were available as on 01.04.2009. In SI.No.5 of the information given, it is stated that there were 56 sanctioned posts in the grade of Assistant Director(IS) on that date. As per the earlier rules, if 25% is to be kept aside for promotion, the number would be 14. As stated in that Annexure-A30, 5 posts were already filled up as on 01.04.2009 and as such the available vacancies were only 9. As already seen from Annexure-R4, the seniority of the applicant in the list was 13 and it is presumed that SI.Nos.1 to 5 in the list of Annexure-R4 were the persons who are stated to have already been promoted as Assistant Director(IS) on 01.04.2009. The applicant will therefore come under the balance of 9 persons who were eligible to be promoted on 01.04.2009 even under the earlier rules. If the presumption that the persons in the seniority list at Annexure-R4 with SI.Nos.1 to 5 were already promoted as Assistant Director(IS) as on 01.04.2009 is correct, it is clear that the applicant could very well have been promoted as on 01.04.2009 when sufficient number of vacancies were available even on that date under the then extant rules. The OA is therefore allowed and the respondents are directed to convene the DPC with respect to the posts as it existed on 01.04.2009 and give promotions to all the eligible persons based on their seniority, years of service

in the feeder category etc. as per the rules existing as on 01.04.2009 and give them all consequential benefits accordingly, within a period of three(3) months from the date of receipt of this order. In view of the above finding, we do not want to go into the question of delay in the constitution of Departmental Promotion Committee etc. based on the rules which were notified w.e.f. 04.04.2009. No costs.

(C.V.SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

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

/ps/

Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA.No.170/00834/2016

- Annexure-A1: A copy of promotion order dtd.1.12.2009
- Annexure-A2: A copy of minutes of the meeting and office order
- Annexure-A3: Rules with regard to appointment of Assistant Director (Information Service)
- Annexure-A4: Copy of the circular dtd.21.03.2013
- Annexure-A5: Representation letter filed by the applicant dtd.27.02.2013
- Annexure-A6: Petitioner filed another representation dtd.25.3.2013
- Annexure-A7 & A8: A copy of reply by respondent No.1 & 2 dtd.17.5.2013 and 29.05.2013
- Annexure-A9: A copy of application filed under RTI Act dtd.7.10.2013
- Annexure-A10: A copy of the information provided under RTI Act dtd.6.11.2013
- Annexure-A11: Copy of the letter dtd.13.8.2014

OA.No.170/00834/2016/CAT/Bangalore Bench

Annexure-A12: Copy of the request under RTI Act dtd.22.8.2014
 Annexure-A13: Copy of the reply dtd.24.9.2014
 Annexure-A14: Copy of the RTI appeal dtd.6.4.2015
 Annexure-A15: Copy of the reminder letter dtd.25.10.2014
 Annexure-A16: Copy of the reply dtd.09.10.2014
 Annexure-A17: Copy of the reply dtd.29.10.2014
 Annexure-A18: Copy of the letter dtd.18.02.2015
 Annexure-A19: Copy of the order on RTI appeal dtd.13.03.2015
 Annexure-A20: Copy of the RTI order dtd.13.11.2014
 Annexure-A21: Copy of the letter dtd.17.6.2016
 Annexure-A22: Copy of the reminder letter dtd.20.6.2016

Annexures with reply statement:

Annexure-R1: Copy of the notified recruitment rules
 Annexure-R2: Copy of the office order dtd.10.02.2006
 Annexure-R3: Copy of the amendment in recruitment rules
 Annexure-R4: Copy of the final seniority list of Programmer as on 31.03.2007
 Annexure-R5: Copy of the promotion order dtd.01.12.2009

Annexures with rejoinder:

-NIL-

Annexures with reply to the rejoinder:

Annexure-R6: Copy of the representation dtd.28.4.1999
 Annexure-R7: Copy of the representation dtd.12.5.2000
 Annexure-R8: Copy of the representation dtd.30.8.2000
 Annexure-R9: Copy of the representation dtd.1.1.2001
 Annexure-R10: Copy of the order dtd.5.2.2001

Annexures with additional rejoinder:

Annexure-A23: Copy of the OM dtd.8.9.1998
 Annexure-A24: Copy of the OM dtd.17.9.1998
 Annexure-A25: Copy of the OM dtd.18.5.2001
 Annexure-A26: Copy of the circular dtd.30.1.2012
 Annexure-A27: Copy of the OM dtd.28.1.2015
 Annexure-A28: Copy of the OM dtd.23.4.2015
 Annexure-A29: Copy of the High Court of Delhi judgment dtd.3.5.2012
 Annexure-A30: Copy of the letter dtd.9.5.2017

Annexures with the reply to the additional rejoinder:

-NIL-

Annexures with the written arguments note filed by the respondents:

-NIL-

Annexures with the reply to the written arguments note filed by the applicant:

-NIL-
