

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ERNAKULAM BENCH

Original Application Nos.180/00360/2015

Monday, this the 17th day of January, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. E.K. Bharat Bhushan, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judicial Member**

P.M.Padmanabhan
S/o.Late Krishnakurup
Postman, Vadakara Head Post Office
Residing at Sreepadmam,Kurinhalayode
Viiliyapilly (Via), Vadakara 673642 **Applicant**

(By Advocate – Mrs.R.Jagada Bai)

V e r s u s

- 1. Director General (Posts)
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi – 110001
- 2. The Post Master General
Northern Region
Kerala Circle, Kozhikode – 673 011
- 3. The Superintendent of Post Offices
Vatakara Division
Vatakara 673 101 **Respondents**

(By Advocate – Mr.N.Anilkumar,SCGSC)

This Original Application having been heard and reserved for orders on 14.1.2019, the Tribunal on 17.1.2019 delivered the following:

O R D E R

Per: Mr.Ashish Kalia, Judicial Member

The relief claimed by the applicant are as under:

- “1. Call for the records.

2. Quash Annexure A-13, Annexure A-15 and Annexure A-16.

3. Declare that the applicant is eligible to be appointed against the vacancy of Postman ear marked for seniority quota of the year 2004-2005 in Vatakara Postal Division from the date of arising of vacancy as ordered by this Tribunal in Annexure A1 and Annexure A9 which was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala

4. Re-fix his pay and allowances in the pay band for Postman recommended by the Sixth Central Pay Commission with effect from 1.1.2006

5. Pay arrears of salary from the date of filing of O.A. No. 704/2006, that is from 15.10.2006.

6. Declare that the applicant is eligible to get this entire notional service from the date of arising of vacancy for the year 2004-2005 as his pensionable service.

7. To issue such other appropriate orders or directions this Tribunal may deem fit, just and proper in the circumstances of the case.

8. Grant costs to the applicant as he had to spend Rs. 60,450/- towards the legal expenses for perusing the unwarranted litigation which could have been averted by the respondent had they acted according to the rules of the department.”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant was initially engaged as Gramin Dak Sevak on 11.09.1978. He was officiating against the vacant post of Postman with effect from 28.08.2006. He filed O.A. No. 704/2006 on 15.10.2006 for promotion as Postman for the vacancy of 2004-2005 against seniority quota before this Tribunal. This Tribunal while disposing of the Original Application on 23.4.2007, had directed to take immediate steps for filling up the promotional vacancies in the cadre of Postman for the year 2004-05 in Vadakara Post Office and to consider the applicant in accordance with his seniority and his eligibility in terms of the Recruitment Rules. Another O.A. No. 349 of 2009 was filed for implementation of the Central

Administrative Tribunal's order at Annexure A-1. This Tribunal again directed to implement the order passed by this Tribunal earlier. Ultimately, this matter went before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala which has decided the matter as under:-

“13. The right of the applicant for consideration for promotion against the three vacancies for the year 2005 had crystallized in the order of this Tribunal dated 23.4.2007 (Annexure A-9). Therefore, there was no justification for the non-consideration of the applicant for promotion in the meeting of the D.P.C held on 7.8.2007 in which his junior was selected for promotion. The Annexure A-14 order dated 7.8.2007 selecting the 5th respondent, who is junior to the applicant, is vitiated by the non-consideration of the applicant for promotion. The applicant's acceptance of the Group.D post in March, 2009, knowing fully that once he was inducted in the Group-D cadre, the question of his promotion to the cadre of Postman under the GDS quota would not arise, does not constitute a waiver of his right to be considered for promotion for the vacancies for the year 2005 in 2007.

14. In the light of the above, the selection and appointment of the 5th respondent to the cadre of Postman overlooking the seniority of the applicant is illegal. Hence it is ordered as under:

15. Annexure A-14 memo dated 7.8.2007 appointing the 5th respondent to the cadre of Postman is hereby quashed and set aside. The respondents are directed to fill up the resultant vacancy in accordance with the direction given in the order dated 23.4.2007 in O.A No.704/2006 within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

16. The O.A is allowed as above. No order as to costs. “

3. In Original Application No.349/2009, the Tribunal had quashed the promotion of his junior, which was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

4. On 2.8.2013, applicant was promoted with effect from 23.8.2007. Thereafter applicant made a representation on 23.09.2013 specifying his claim for promotion against the vacancies for the year 2004 and 2005. The claim of the applicant was rejected by impugned order at Annexure A-13. It reads:

"Memo No.O.A 349/2009 dated at Vadakara the 02.08.2013.

In pursuance of directions contained in RO, Calicut letter No.NR/LC/4-5/OA349/2009, dated 31.07.2013 to implement the judgement dated 22.02.2011 pronounced by the Honourable Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench in O.A No.349/2009 in accordance with the order dated 23.04.2007 in O.A No.704/2006. Sri.P.M.Padmanabhan, GDSMD Kurinhallyode now working as MTS, Divisional Office Vadakara is hereby appointed to the cadre of Postman in the Pay Band PB 1 of Rs.5200-20200 with Grade Pay of Rs.2000/- after completion of the prescribed training.

His appointment will be subject to the following terms and conditions.

1. The appointment will be notional from 23.08.2007 (the date of joining of Sri.N.K.Balachandran) to the actual date of his joining as postman and he will draw actual pay and allowance w.e.f the date of joining as postman only.
2. The notional period will be counted only for the purpose of pension under the new pension scheme applicable w.e.f 01.01.2004.
3. He will not be entitled to any arrears of pay and allowance for the notional service. He will be governed by the New Pension Scheme applicable to Central Government employees w.e.f 01.10.2004. He is also informed that the system of defined benefit pension scheme shall not be applicable to him and in its place the new restructured defined contribution pension system shall be applicable as contained in DG Posts letter No.4-28/03-Pen dated 17/12/2003.

4. His pay will be fixed notionally w.e.f 23.08.2007, but the actual pay will be drawn w.e.f the date of joining as postman in Vadakara Division only.

5. His seniority will be fixed above Sri.N.K.Balachandran in the gradation list.

6. His appointment as postman will be adjusted against the unfilled vacancy of 2007.

7. The appointment will be subject to the outcome of the SLP(Civil) No.35223/12 filed by Smt.Y.Najithamol and others.

8. He will be on probation for a period of two years.

(A.Mohamadkutty)
Superintendent of Post Offices
Vadakara Division, Vadakara – 673101”

5. Aggrieved by this Annexure A-13 order, applicant has approached this Tribunal for redressal of his grievances.

6. Notices were issued to the respondents. They entered appearance through Shri.N.Anilkumar,SCGSC and argued the matter at length.

7. It is stated by the respondents that the applicant had worked as GDS in the Department from 11.9.1978 and filed O.A No.704/2006 seeking a declaration that the approval of screening committee is not necessary for filling up the postman vacancies relating to the year 2004-2005 set apart for 25% GDS seniority quota. It is further submitted that there were no vacancies remaining to be filled up under the seniority quota in 2004. Out of the 3 vacancies, two vacancies were remaining to be filled up for the year

2005 as one vacancy was already filled up by appointing Shri.N.K.Balachandran following the Recruitment Rules in force that time. Two seniormost GDS were selected for appointment in the light of judgment in O.ANo.704/2006. The Contempt Petition filed by the applicant was disposed of vide Annexure R1(a) order in the year 2009. On the strength of the order in O.A 130/2007 to fill up the vacancies of Group D, as directed by the Tribunal, 6 vacancies were filled up and Shri.P.M.Padmanabhan had also given his application for appointment as Group D and joined the post of Group D w.e.f 11.3.2009. In the year 2005, 12 vacancies arose in Postman cadre. Two vacancies were approved for compassionate appointment. One vacancy was set apart under 25% seniority quota, against which Sri.N.K.Balachandran, GDS MD was selected and appointed w.e.f 23.08.2007, following the Postman Recruitment Rules in force then. The maximum age limit of 50 is the criteria for General category candidates, for OBC it is 53 years and for SC/ST it is 55 years. As such, the applicant has crossed the age of 50 years, he was not eligible to be considered for appointment as Postman. Hence eligible candidate within the age limit was appointed. On implementing the order in O.A No.704/2006, the remaining two vacancies were filled up by selecting the two seniormost GDS. The applicant's contention that vacancies were lying unfilled in Vadakara Division owing to laxity on the part of the respondents in taking timely action is incorrect. The posts were filled up as per Rules and instructions of the Department and the direction of the Courts's on the matter. As the

applicant did not come under the age limit, he was not selected. Pursuant to O.A 349/09, the appointment of Mr.N.K.Balachandran was quashed for promoting him as Postman against one of the 3 vacancies for the year 2005 with all consequential benefits including seniority and arrears of pay and allowances. This order was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

8. The respondents have given appointment to the applicant as Postman vide its order dated 2.8.2013. He was given notional appointment with effect from 23.08.2007 (i.e, the date of joining of Sri.N.K.Balachandran). Lastly, the applicant again made a representation seeking seniority with effect from 2005 which was rejected by the respondents and it is further submitted that since the applicant's appointment was on notional basis, claim for pay and allowances for the period of notional appointment is not tenable.

9. Applicant has filed rejoinder to the reply statement. Thereafter additional reply statement was filed by the respondents. Thereupon, additional rejoinder was also filed.

10. Heard Mrs.R.Jagada Bai, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.N.Anilkumar,SCGSC, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the records.

11. The short question raised by the applicant herein is whether he is

entitled to get the post of Postman from the date of occurrence of vacancy or from the date of joining of his junior Shri.N.K.Balachandran.

12. The Hon'ble apex court in **Y. NAJITHAMOL & ORS. v. SOUMYA S.D. & ORS.** in Civil Appeal No. 91 OF 2015 held as under:

“3. Aggrieved of the order of the Tribunal, the appellants challenged the correctness of the same by way of filing a Writ Petition before the High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam. The Division Bench of the High Court came to the conclusion that a reading of Columns 11(1) and (2) of the Recruitment Rules does not support the claim that appointments to the said posts are being made by way of direct recruitment instead of promotion. The Division Bench of the High Court held as under:

“We are only concerned with Col.11 (1), 11(2)(i) and 11(2)(ii). The entire vacancies as of now is divided into two portions, i.e. 50% could not be made by promotion from Group D on the basis of their merit in the departmental examination, then the unfulfilled vacancies would go to Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of the rank list in the departmental examination. Then among the other 50%, 25% would go to persons based on the seniority who need not take any departmental examination and for that 25%, if candidates are not sufficient for consideration to the post of Postman based on the seniority, the rest will again go to Extra Departmental Agents based on the merit in the rank list in the departmental examination, then the other 25% from among the Extra Departmental Agents based on the merit in the departmental examination. If still any vacancies are available, from one recruiting division to another postal division is also contemplated and after exhausting that process, if the posts are still remain unfilled again from one postal division located in the same station to another postal division located in the circle. After exhausting the exercise contemplated under Col.11 (1) to (4), if any posts are vacant, then the question of direct recruitment from the nominees of Employment Exchange comes into play. Reading of Column 11(2) to (4), nowhere it refers to any direct recruitment as such. It only says by promotion so far as Group D and if candidates are not sufficient for promotion in Group D, then it goes to Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of merit in the examination. If the intention were to be by promotion only from Group D candidates, then the unfilled from the category under Column 11(1) ought not to have been earmarked for Extra Departmental Agents based on their merit in the Departmental examination.”

The High Court accordingly dismissed the Writ Petitions filed by the appellants herein questioning the correctness of the order passed by the Tribunal. Hence the present appeals.

4. We have heard Mr. V. Giri, the learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants in the Civil Appeal 90 of 2015 and Mr. N.K. Kaul, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of Union of India and Dr. K.P. Kylashnath Pillay, learned senior advocate appearing on behalf of some of the respondents.

5. The essential question of law which arises for our consideration in the instant case is whether the appointment of the appellants to the post of Postman is by way of direct recruitment or by promotion.

6. We first turn our attention to the relevant rules at play in the instant case, which are the Recruitment Rules. The Schedule to the said Recruitment Rules specifies the method of recruitment, age limit, qualifications etc. relating to appointments to the said posts. Column 1 specifies the name of the post as Postman/Village Postman, and Column 3 specifies it to be a Group 'C' post.

7. Column 11 of the Recruitment Rules which is at the heart of the controversy in the present case, reads as under:

"Method of recruitment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by deputation/transfer and percentage of the vacancies to be filled by various methods :-

1. 50% by promotion, failing which by Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of their merit in the Departmental Examination.

2. 50% by Extra Departmental Agents of the recruiting division of Unit, in the following manner, namely:

(i) 25% of vacancies of postman shall be filled up from amongst Extra Departmental Agents with a minimum of 5 years of service on the basis of their seniority, failing which by the Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of Departmental examination.

(ii) 25% from amongst Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of their merit in the departmental examination.

3. If the vacancies remained unfilled by EDAs of the recruiting division, such vacancies may be so filled by EDAs of the postal division failing in the Zone of Regional Director.

4. If the vacancies remained unfilled by EDAs of the recruiting units such vacancies may be filled by EDAs of the postal divisions located at the same station. Vacancies remaining unfilled will be thrown upon to Extra Departmental Agents in the region.

5. Any vacancy remaining unfilled shall be filled up by direct recruitment through the nominees of the Employment Exchange."

A careful reading of the above Column makes it clear that essentially two 'pools' are envisaged from which appointments to the post of Postman can be made. One is the pool of those candidates who are being promoted, and

the other is the pool of the Extra Departmental Agents who are appointed to the said post after passing a departmental examination. 50% of the candidates being appointed to the post of Postman are selected by way of promotion. The remaining 50% of the candidates are selected in two ways. 25% of the candidates are selected from amongst the Extra Departmental Agents on the basis of their seniority in service, and the other 25% candidates are selected from the Extra Departmental Agents based on their merit in the Departmental Examination.

8. Further, Column 12 of the Recruitment Rules reads as under:

“In case of recruitment by promotion/deputation/transfer grade from which promotion/deputation/transfer to be made:

1. Promotion from Group 'D' officials who have put in three years of regular and satisfactory service as on the closing date for receipt of applications through a Departmental examination.
2. Extra Departmental Agents through a Departmental Examination.
3. Direct recruitment through a Departmental Examination.”

The post in the instant case, that of Postman is a Group 'C' post. Thus, it is quite natural that 'promotion' to the said post can happen only from the feeder post, which in the instant case, are the Group 'D' posts. Admittedly, GDS is not a Group 'D' post, and members of GDS are merely Extra Departmental Agents.

9. At this stage, it is also useful to refer to the decision of this Court in the case of C.C. Padmanabhan & Ors. v. Director of Public Instructions & Ors.- 1980 (Supp) SCC 668, wherein it was held as under:

“This definition fully conforms to the meaning of 'promotion' as understood in ordinary parlance and also as a term frequently used in cases involving service laws. According to it a person already holding a post would have a promotion if he is appointed to another post which satisfies either of the following two conditions, namely-

- (i) that the new post is in a higher category of the same service or class of service;
- (ii) the new post carries a higher grade in the same service or class.”

Promotion to a post, thus, can only happen when the promotional post and the post being promoted from are a part of the same class of service. Gramin Dak Sevak is a civil post, but is not a part of the regular service of the postal department. In the case of Union of India v. Kameshwar Prasad – (1997) 11 SCC 650 this Court held as under:

“2. The Extra Departmental Agents system in the Department of

Posts and Telegraphs is in vogue since 1854. The object underlying it is to cater to postal needs of the rural communities dispersed in remote areas. The system avails of the services of schoolmasters, shopkeepers, landlords and such other persons in a village who have the faculty of reasonable standard of literacy and adequate means of livelihood and who, therefore, in their leisure can assist the Department by way of gainful avocation and social service in ministering to the rural communities in their postal needs, through maintenance of simple accounts and adherence to minimum procedural formalities, as prescribed by the Department for the purpose. [See: Swamy's Compilation of Service Rules for Extra Departmental Staff in Postal Department p. 1.]”

Further, a three-judge Bench of this Court in the case of The Superintendent of Post Offices & Ors. v. P.K. Rajamma - (1977) 3 SCC 94 held as under:

“It is thus clear that an extra departmental agent is not a casual worker but he holds a post under the administrative control of the State. It is apparent from the rules that the employment of an extra departmental agent is in a post which exists "apart from" the person who happens to fill it at any particular time. Though such a post is outside the regular civil services, there is no doubt it is a post under the State. The tests of a civil post laid down by Court in Kanak Chandra Dutta's case (supra) are clearly satisfied in the case of the extra departmental agents.”

(emphasis laid by this Court)

A perusal of the above judgments of this Court make it clear that Extra Departmental Agents are not in the regular service of the postal department, though they hold a civil post. Thus, by no stretch of imagination can the post of GDS be envisaged to be a feeder post to Group 'C' posts for promotion.

10. A Full Bench of the Ernakulam Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal in the case of M.A. Mohanan v. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices & Ors. - OA No. 807 of 1999 decided on 3.11.1999 had the occasion to consider a similar question. The majority opinion of the Tribunal held as under:

“As the name itself indicates, EDAs are not departmental employees. They become departmental employees from the date of their regular absorption as such. And promotions are only for departmental employees. Therefore, EDAs cannot be treated as 'promoted' as Postmen. They can be treated as only appointed as Postmen. It is further seen from instructions of Director General Posts under Rule 4 of Swamy's publication referred to earlier that EDAs service are terminated on appointment as Postman and hence they become eligible for ex gratia gratuity. If the recruitment of EDAs as Postman is treated as a promotion, the question of termination will not arise. This also leads one to conclude that the recruitment of EDAs Postman cannot be treated as one of promotion.

Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court in C.C. Padmanabhan and Ors. v. Director of Public Instructions and Ors., 1980 (Suppl.) SCC 668=1981(1) SLJ 165 (SC), observed that 'Promotion' as understood in ordinary parlance and also

as a term frequently used in cases involving service laws means that a person already holding a position would have a promotion if he is appointed to another post which satisfies either of the two conditions namely that the new post is in higher category of the same service or class. Applying the above criteria appointment as Postman from EDA cannot be termed as promotion as the posts of Postman and EDA belong to two different services viz. regular Postal Service' and 'Extra Departmental Postal Service'.”

(emphasis laid by this Court)

11. The Tribunal in the instant case sought to distinguish the aforementioned case with the case in hand, by placing reliance on another decision of the Tribunal and holding that the Full Bench was concerned with the cases of those candidates covered under Column 11(2)(i), whereas the case of the candidates in the instant case was covered under Column 11(2)(ii), and thus, the decision of the Full Bench has no bearing on the facts of the case on hand. This reasoning of the Tribunal cannot be sustained, as the Full Bench of the Tribunal was clearly adjudicating the broader question of whether the appointment of Extra Departmental Agents to the post of Postman is by way of direct recruitment or by way of promotion. The attempt to distinguish the ratio of the Full Bench of the Tribunal on such a superficial ground is akin to reading the decision of the Full Bench like a Statute, which cannot be sustained.

12. The Division Bench of the High Court placed reliance on the wording of Column 11(1) to conclude that since the Extra Departmental Agents being appointed as provided under Column 11(1) can be called as promotees, then the Extra Departmental Agents under Column 11(2)(i) and (ii) also must be treated at par. The said reasoning of the High Court also cannot be sustained. It is nobody's case that the Extra Departmental Agents being appointed under Column 11(1) be called promotees. The language of Column 11(1) itself makes this crystal clear. The use of the words 'failing which' makes it obvious that there is a distinction between those candidates who are being selected by way of promotion, and the candidates who are Extra Departmental Agents and have cleared the departmental examination, and that the latter will be considered for appointment only if there are no eligible candidates under the former category. Thus, the appointment of GDS to the post of Postman can only be said to be by way of direct recruitment and not promotion.”

13. The Hon'ble apex court in *Y. Najithamol's* case (supra) had held that the selection of extra departmental agents or Gramin Dak Sevaks to the post of Postman under Column 11(2)(ii) of the Recruitment Rules is only by way of direct recruitment and not by way of promotion. This Tribunal initially treating this post as a promotional post and given directions for consideration to the post of Postman was not found feasible for the reasons

that the applicant has not within the age limit as per the Recruitment Rules. He should have less than the age of 50 years and the Tribunal under the belief that the post of GDS being a feeder category, in the post of Postman there should not have been any age limit for promotion. Be that as it may, the promotion given to the applicant was with effect from 23.08.2007, on the date of promotion of his junior Shri.N.K.Balachandran. In terms of the latest judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court referred above, the legal position in this matter is crystal clear and there is no scope to interpret this any further. The GDS post being a civil post is however outside the regular civil services and it is also not the feeder post to the post of Postman. In other words for the first time it gets inducted into the regular civil post only as a Postman. Therefore, the career start with Department of Posts from the date of appointment as Postman and he/she is entitled for salary, increments, upgradation after requisite service, further chances of promotion to higher post only from the date of appointment as Postman. The applicant has deemed to have joined on the date of his junior was given promotion/appointment i.e, on 23.8.2007. We found no irregularity in the rejection of his representation vide Annexure A-13, wherein the respondents have categorically followed the legal position in the matter in hand. By impugned Annexure A-13 order, the respondents had given him notional appointment with effect from 23.08.2007 which will be counted for the purpose of pension only under the new pension scheme applicable in the present case and will not be entitled for any arrears of pay and allowances for the notional service.

14. In view of above fact, circumstance and legal position discussed, we hold that the present Original Application is devoid of merit and hence, the Original Application fails and it is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

(E.K.BHARAT BHUSHAN)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

SV

List of Annexures

Annexure A-1 - Copy of the order in O.A No.704/2006 pronounced on 25.04.2007 by this Hon'ble Tribunal.

Annexure A-2 - Copy of the order in R.A No.32/2007 in O.A No.704/2006 pronounced on 28.02.2008 by this Tribunal.

Annexure A-3 - Copy of the Interim Order in CPC No.55/2008 in O.ANo.704/2006 pronounced on 8.8.2008 by this Tribunal

Annexure A-4 - Copy of the Interim Order in CPC No.55/2008 in O.A No.704/2006 pronounced on 13.10.2008 by this Tribunal

Annexure A-5 - Copy of the interim order inCPCNo.55/2008in O.A No.704/2006 pronounced on 17.11.2008 by this Tribunal

Annexure A-6 - Copy of the Interim Order in O.ANo.349/2006 pronounced on 26.7.2010 by this Tribunal

Annexure A-7 - Copy of the Interim order in O.ANo.349/2006 pronounced on 4.8.2010by this Tribunal

Annexure A-8 - Copy of the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No.24393 of 2010 (S) pronounced on 16.8.2010

Annexure A-9 - Copy of the order of thisTribunal in O.ANo.349/2009 pronounced on 22.2.2011

Annexure A-10 - Copy of the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in OP(CAT) No.1696 of2011 (Z) pronounced on 2012.2011

Annexure A-11 - Copy of the Interim Orderin CPCNo.60/2013 in O.A No.349/2009 pronounced on 27.5.2013by this Tribunal

Annexure A-12 - Copy of the Interim Orderin CPCNo.60/2013 in O.A No.349/2009pronounced on 8.8.2013 by this Tribunal

Annexure A-13 - Order issued by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Vatakara Division under No.OA 349/2009 dated 2.8.2013

Annexure A-14(Series) Copy of the representation and the reminder dated 23.9.2013and 9.1.2014 submitted by the applicant to the respondent no.3.

Annexure A-15 - Order issued by the Superintendent of Post Offices,

Vatakara Division under No.OA 349/2009 dated 31.1.2014

Annexure A-16 - Order issued by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Vatakara Division under No.OA 349/2009 dated 6.2.2014

Annexure A-17 - Copy of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Appeal (Civil) 7953 of 2004 pronounced on 7.4.2007.

Annexure R1(a) - True copy of the order dated 3.4.2009 in C.P(C) No.55 of 2008 in O.A No.704 of 2006

Annexure R1(b) - True copy of the letter No.Rectt/4-5/2005 II dated 25.10.2006

Annexure A-18 - Copy of the order in Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in OP(CAT) No.50 of 2015 (Z) dated 3.9.2014.

Annexure R1(c) - True copy of the affidavit filed by the respondents in CP(C) 55/08 in O.A 704/2006

Annexure R1(d) - True copy of the status report filed by CPC No.60 of 2013

Annexure R1(e) - True copy of the order dated 8.8.2013 in CPC No.60 of 2013 in O.A No.34 of 2009 of this Tribunal.

Annexure R1(f) - True copy of the list showing seniority position of the applicant

...