

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00766/2018

DATED THIS THE 31st DAY OF JULY, 2019

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

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

V.Soundararajan
Aged 45 years
S/o Sri Vellaichamy
Scientist-C, IT Cell
Institute of Wood Science and Technology
18th Cross, Malleshwaram
Bangalore-560 003.

....Applicant

(By Advocate Dr.S.Rajendran)

Vs.

1. Union of India, represented by:
The Director General
Indian Council of Forestry Research & Education
New Forest P.O.
Dehra Dun-248 006
Uttarakhand State.
2. The Secretary
M/o Environment, Forests and Climate Change
Prithvi Block – I Floor
Indira Parayavaran Bhavan
Jor Bagh Road
New Delhi-110 003.
3. The Secretary
Department of Personnel and Training
M/o Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions
North Block
New Delhi-110 001.Respondents

(By Advocate Sri Vishnu Bhat)

O R D E R

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

The factual matrix of the case are as follows:

The applicant is a Scientist-C working in the Institute of Wood Science and Technology(IWST), Bangalore since April 2004. IWST is one of the constituent research institutes of the Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education(ICFRE), Dehra Dun. The 1st respondent vide job advertisement(Annexure-A1) had invited applications from qualified candidates for filling up of 8 vacant Scientists-B(Computer Application) in different institutes of the ICFRE in the year 2003 prescribing the educational qualifications of MCA/M.Sc in Physics/Maths/Statistics with PG Diploma in Computer from Institute/University recognised by GOI/B.E/B.Tech(Computer Science) with first class or minimum 60% aggregate. The applicant had applied for Scientist-B as he has the First Class M.Sc.(Mathematics) vide Annexure-A3 and first class in M.Tech(Computer Application)(Annexure-A4). After due verification of the educational qualifications of the applicant, the 1st respondent had selected the applicant for Scientist-B and appointed him at the IWST, Bangalore vide order dtd.3.4.2004(Annexure-A5). The applicant was given in-situ promotion to Scientist-C under Flexible Complementary Scheme(FCS) in the year 2009. The 3rd respondent vide order dtd.10.9.2010(Annexure-A6) had modified the existing FCS promotion for all the scientists working in different ministries and research institutes of GOI stating that the Scientists who have Master degree in Natural Science/Agricultural Sciences or Bachelor's degree in Engineering Technology/Medicines are only eligible for promotion to higher categories under

the MFCS and directed all the Ministries/Departments to implement the OM of Assessments of Scientists from 1.1.2011 onwards. The 3rd respondent had further clarified to the FAQ vide order dtd.23.9.2011(Annexure-A7) that the educational qualifications viz., MCA, M.Sc(Information Technology), M.Sc(Statistics), M.Sc (Mathematics), MA(Operational Research) and M.Sc(Total Quality Management) are not covered under the MFCS for higher promotions of the Scientists. The 1st respondent had brought out new RRs in 2011 vide order dtd.24.8.2011(Annexure-A8) prescribing educational qualifications. In the meantime, the M/o Electronics and Information Technology had moved R3 to include M.Sc(Electronics) and M.Sc(Applied Electronics) degrees for the promotions of its scientists under the MFCS and the 3rd respondent had included such degrees for promotion of scientists vide order dtd.5.9.2013(Annexure-A9).

2. The applicant submits that he was due for promotion from Scientist-C to Scientist-D in the year 2013 but the 1st respondent had not included his name in the list of eligible scientists for promotion in spite of the applicant having the required educational qualifications and the satisfactory service. When the 1st respondent had not given opportunity of being heard, the applicant filed representation in the year 2014 to which the 1st respondent had replied vide order dtd.22.9.2014(Annexure-A10) informing that necessary clarification with regard to the eligibility for promotion in respect of scientists possessing the qualification of M.Tech(Computer Science) was sought from the Secretary, ICFRE and on receipt of clarification further action would be taken. Later 1st respondent vide order dtd.4.11.2015(Annexure-A11) had informed that the educational

qualification of the applicant viz., M.Tech(Computer Application) does not come under extant rules/guidelines laid down by the 3rd respondent and hence the request of the applicant could not be considered at that stage. Some autonomous research bodies viz., the Indian Plywood Industries Research and Training Institute (IPIRTI), Bangalore and the G.B.Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment & Sustainable Development (GBPNIHESD) Almora working under the 2nd respondent had similar problems for their scientists and represented the grievances of their scientists to the 2nd respondent who had accorded his sanction to include the degrees excluded by the 3rd respondent. Similarly the Board of Governors of the ICFRE in its meeting held on 5.2.2016 had passed a resolution dtd.5.2.2016(Annexure-A12) to include the excluded degrees for promotion of its scientists to higher grades under the MFCS but the 2nd respondent as ex-officio Chairman of the Board of Governors of the ICFRE has not yet approved the said resolution. Consequently, the 1st respondent is unable to promote the scientists with the excluded educational degrees. Then the applicant had sent a representation dtd.21.8.2017(Annexure-A13) along with another representation dtd.27.12.2017 (Annexure-A14) to consider his case for promotion.

3. The applicant further submits that the 1st respondent had brought out new RRs in the year 2018 vide order dtd.24.1.2018(Annexure-A15) prescribing the educational qualifications of First class Master's degree in Natural Science/Agriculture Sciences and a Ph.D degree in the relevant subject/discipline or First Class Master's degree in Engineering or Technology for

promotion of scientists. Even though the applicant is eligible for promotion as per RR 2011 and RR 2018, the 1st respondent did not include his name in the eligibility list of scientists dtd.17.4.2018(Annexure-A16) for promotion from Scientist-C to D from the year 2013 onwards and from Scientist-D to Scientist-E in the year 2017 onwards. Being aggrieved by the same, the applicant has filed the present OA with the following relief:

- a. To quash the Annexure-A11 dtd.4.11.2015 and*
- b. To modify the Annexure-A16 dtd.17.4.2018 so as to include the name of the applicant in the list of eligible scientists for promotion from Scientist-C to Scientist-D.*
- c. The Respondent No.1 may be directed to apply his mind in this case and take necessary actions to promote the applicant from Scientist-C to D as on 1.7.2013 and from D to E as on 1.7.2017 with all financial benefits within three months from the date of receipt of the order of the Hon'ble Tribunal.*
- d. The respondent No.2 may be directed to take an appropriate decision on the resolution vide the Annexure-A12 dtd.5.2.2016.*
- e. To invalidate/quash the definition of Scientists and Engineers given by the respondent No.3 in the Annexure-II of the Annexure-A6 dtd.10.9.2010 issued by the respondent No.3.*

4. The applicant submits that he is being denied promotion since 2013 in spite of having the essential qualification for promotion. Promotion is a condition of service of an employee. When the 1st respondent decides to alter the conditions of promotion of the applicant, he has to give an opportunity of being heard to the applicant. Failure to do so is violation of natural justice and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Grid Corporation of Orissa and Ors vs. Rasanand Das* reported in (2003) 10 SCC 297 held that the conditions of service could not be altered to the disadvantage of the employees. In *The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research vs. K.G.S.Bhat* (AIR 1989 SC 72), the Hon'ble Apex Court

held that every management must provide realistic opportunities for promising employees to move forward. It is further held that it was necessary to provide suitable promotional avenues to the employees in their career. When the Board of Governors of the ICFRE in its 53rd Meeting had passed a resolution to include the excluded degrees for the promotion of scientists, the 2nd respondent had not approved it even though he had approved it for other research institutes. Consequently 1st respondent is unable to promote the applicant and other similarly placed scientists. The inordinate delay of the 2nd respondent is causing anguish and hardship to the applicant. Not treating the equals equally is against the principles of equality as enshrined in the Constitution and violations of it is ultra vires the Constitution. The action of the 3rd respondent in prescribing different educational qualifications than entry level qualification for promotion is bad in service jurisprudence and is ultra vires the constitution. The Hon'ble CAT, Allahabad Bench vide order dtd.5.5.2016(Annexure-A17) in Dr.Harish Kumar of ICFRE vs. UOI held that prescribing different educational qualifications other than the entry level qualification is not correct. The 3rd respondent has no competency to exclude the degrees viz., Master of Science in Mathematics and other pure science subjects, by administrative guidelines to deny the promotional opportunities for those scientists who have such degrees. The definition of scientists given by the 3rd respondent in Annexure-A6 order dtd.10.9.2010 is ultra vires the constitution for the reason that it is a class quasi-legislation and it discriminates and differentiates the equally placed scientists in many organisations. The applicants has quoted the orders of Hon'ble High Court of

Delhi in *D.P.Singh vs. UOI & Ors.* in *WP(C).No.4351/2010 & WP(C) No.4886/2010* and in *S.K.Murti vs. UOI & Ors in WP(C).No.14263/2004* in support of his contentions.

5. The respondents, on the other hand, have submitted in their reply statement that as per DoPT OM dtd.10.9.2010 and further clarification issued by DoPT vide FAQ that M.Sc.(Mathematics) and M.Tech (Computer Application) is not eligible for promotion under Flexible Complementing Scheme(FCS). The FCS is applicable in all the scientific organisations under the Ministry. These organisations are required to amend the provisions of the relevant recruitments so that FCS is brought in conformity with the decisions/guidelines of DoPT on the subject. The autonomous organisations such as the Indian Plywood Industries Research and Training Institute (IPIRTI), Bangalore and the G.B.Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment & Sustainable Development (GBPNIHESD) Almora under the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change are required to place the scheme before their respective Governing bodies. Assessment of Scientist from 1st January 2011 is required to be done as per modified FCS. The IPIRTI has confirmed that for promotion under FCS of its Scientist (B to G), IPIRTI follows 'recruitment and promotion rules for the Scientific Group 'A' post of IPIRTI and also that no Scientist in their organisation has been considered for FCS having academic qualifications excluded by DoPT in their OMs. The GBPNIHESD follows DoPT extant instructions/guidelines regarding MFCS but with partial deviation. However, this deviation with regard to implementation of FCS in GBPNIHESD is not as per guidelines issued by the

DoPT. The Board of Governors(BoG) of Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education(ICFRE) in its 53rd meeting had considered the proposal regarding the scientists for MFCS having qualification of MCA, M.Sc(IT), M.Sc(Statistics), M.Sc(Mathematics), MA(Operational Research) and M.Sc(Total Quality Management) and approved the same for sending it to the Ministry for further necessary action. The proposal was examined by the Ministry in the light of DoPT instructions contained in OM dtd.10.9.2010 and FAQ dtd.23.9.2011 for promotion under MFCS and vide letter dtd.29.3.2017 advised ICFRE to devise the draft Rules. Then ICFRE notified 'Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education Group 'A' (Scientific Posts) Rules 2018' in place of existing ICFRE Group 'A' (Scientific Posts) Rules 2011 and according to which the applicant is not eligible to be considered for in-situ promotion under MFCS as he does not possess the required academic qualification. But he will continue to get at least 3 financial upgradations as per provisions of MACP Scheme prescribed by DoPT. In the offer of appointment of the applicant for the post of Scientist B, in para 2 of sub-para V , it is stated that 'all other terms and conditions of the service will be governed by the relevant rules and order of the Council in force from time to time'. There is no change in the service conditions of the applicant as claimed by the applicant. The in-situ promotion of applicant is governed by the guidelines issued by DoPT on FCS.

6. The respondents submit that the applicant has mis-quoted the order dtd.5.5.2016 of Hon'ble CAT, Allahabad Bench passed in OA.No.39/2015. In compliance of the said order, the DG, ICFRE issued an order dtd.24.10.2016 stating that as per

provisions of DoPT/FCS, Dr.Harish Kumar, the applicant in that OA cannot be granted in-situ promotion under FCS scheme. Being aggrieved, Dr.Harish Kumar filed CP.125/2017 wherein the 1st respondent has filed compliance report dtd.23.8.2018(Annexure-R1) stating that the Dr.Harish Kumar does not fulfil the criteria laid down in MFCS for in-situ promotion from Scientist E to Scientist F and therefore, he cannot be promoted under MFCS. Then the Allahabad Bench of CAT dismissed the CP vide order dtd.24.9.2018(Annexure-R2) stating that no wilful contempt is made out on part of the respondents. The instructions issued by DoPT on FCS needs to be adopted without changing the basic feature of the FCS. However, the educational qualification prescribed for FCS which is based on policy decision cannot be modified or relaxed even for the autonomous organisation. Further, DoPT has stated that the post requiring qualification of MCA cannot be considered as scientific post as per guidelines on FCS. The ICFRE is bound by the instructions and guidelines issued by GOI from time to time. Therefore, the OA is liable to be dismissed.

7. The applicant has filed rejoinder reiterating the submissions already made in the OA and submits that the respondents have overlooked the different educational qualifications covered under the FCS as has been explained in Sl.No.4 of Annexure-A8, one of the qualification is Bachelor's degree in Technology. The applicant has a first class M.Tech in Computer Application which is higher than the Bachelor's degree in technology. He meets the educational qualifications prescribed in both RR 2011 of the Council and the DoPT's instructions and clarifications. Non considering of his case by the 1st respondent is arbitrary and

discriminatory. The contention of the respondents that the applicant is not eligible for promotion with regard to the nature of his post is not correct as he has not been considered for promotion not based on the nature of his post but on his educational qualification i.e. M.Tech in Computer Application. When the respondents say that autonomous organisations are required to follow the FCS as per guidelines of the DoPT, many scientists were denied their promotions and the ministries had sent their representations to the DoPT who relented and authorised them to follow their own recruitment policies to frame the rules to help them in their promotions. Accordingly, the autonomous organisations working under the M/o Environment(G B Pant Institute) and the M/o Electronics and Information had modified their different recruitment and promotion rules for the promotion of their scientists vide order dtd.19.9.2016(Annexure-A20). Respondents say that the G B Pant Institute follows the DoPT guidelines but with partial deviation. But in the year 2013, the Institute had promoted three scientists having the excluded educational qualifications in Mathematics, Computer Science, Computer Application and Library Science vide order dtd.11.8.2014(Annexure-A19). It shows that the instructions and guidelines of the DoPT are not rigid and it can be modified by the autonomous organisations to suit their policies of promoting their scientists. The statement of the respondents that the Council has brought in RR 2018 after the approval of the Board of Governors of the Council is not disputed. But it does not include the recommendations of the Board of Governors to include the excluded degrees for the promotion of its scientists. On the contention of the respondents that the

applicant will continue to get at least three financial upgradations under MACP, he submits that those scientists who have no good performance and if they fail to get promotion continuously three times will automatically get into MACP for financial upgradation. The financial upgradations under MACP is not attractive as in the FCS and hence, he is declining to be considered under the MACP and asserts that he is eligible for promotion under the MFCS. The respondents' contention that there is no change in the service conditions of the applicant is incorrect as there is a categorical change in the educational qualifications for the promotion of different categories of the scientists of the Council as is evident in the RRs 2001, 2011 and 2018. Promotion is one of the conditions of service. Any change in the eligibility criterion for promotion is a change in the conditions of service. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Grid Corporation of Orissa* (2003)10 SCC 297 held that conditions of service cannot be altered to the disadvantage of the employees. On the contention that the instructions of DoPT on FCS cannot be modified or relaxed even for the autonomous organisations, the applicant submits that there are different autonomous organisations and ministries which had already modified the basic feature of the FCS with the concurrence of the DoPT.

8. The applicant further contends that the submission of the respondents that he has misquoted the order of the CAT, Allahabad Bench in OA.39/2015 is incorrect as the applicant in that case Dr.Harish Kumar has moved to the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand against the rejection of his contempt application. The case has not attained the finality and so the order passed in OA.39/2015 holds good

until it is stayed by the appellate courts. On the contention that DoPT has stated that the post requiring qualification of MCA cannot be considered as scientific post as per the guidelines on FCS, the applicant submits that he has first class M.Tech degree in Computer Application and not MCA which is different from M.Tech degree. Equating MCA with M.Tech is erroneous in nature. Therefore, he shall be considered for promotion under the FCS.

9. The respondents have filed additional reply statement to the rejoinder and submit that the promotions of scientists in ICFRE are regulated by the criteria laid down by DoPT under FCS. As per the guidelines issued by DoPT vide OM dtd.10.9.2010 only such scientists would be eligible for promotion under the FCS who not only possess the requisite qualifications and are engaged in scientific and innovative activities as distinct from the mere application of technical knowledge. As the applicant does not possess first class Master's degree in Natural Science/Agriculture Sciences or first class Bachelor's degree in Engineering or Technology, he does not fulfil the criteria for eligibility laid down for consideration of in situ promotion from the Scientist C to Scientist D under MFCS. As per the clarification issued by DoPT vide FAQ that M.Sc(Mathematics) and M.Tech(Computer Application) which the applicant possessed is not eligible for promotion under FCS. The G B Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment & Sustainable Development(GBPNIHESD) follows DoPT extant instructions/guidelines regarding MFCS but with partial deviation. However, this deviation with regard to implementation of FCS in GBPNIHESD is not as per guidelines issued by DoPT. Pendency of Writ Petition by Dr.Harish Kumar in the

High Court of Uttarakhand is wrong and denied as they have not yet received any notice in that case.

10. We have heard the Learned Counsel for both the parties and perused the materials placed on record in detail. The applicant has filed written arguments note. The applicant in this case has the basic qualification of M.Sc.(Mathematics) based on which he got the appointment as Scientist-B vide Annexure-A5. He has also been subsequently promoted as Scientist-C in the year 2009. The recruitment rules for Group-A Scientific post in the respondents' institution ICFRE state very clearly that for the post of Scientist-C and above, Master's Degree in Engineering Technology including Computer Science/equivalent is necessary for the post of Scientist-C. Apart from M.Sc.(Maths), the applicant has the Master of Technology in Computer Application which he passed in first class vide Annexure-A4. The issue at stake is created by the DoPT OM dtd.10.9.2010 at Annexure-A6 where the entire process is modified in the existing Flexible Complementing Scheme of Scientists based on the recommendations of 6th CPC. It is crucial to note that in the said OM, the DoPT had directed all the Ministries, departments to initiate action for review of the provisions of the existing FCS and amend the provisions of the relevant recruitment rules so that the scheme is brought in conformity with the decision/guidelines being conveyed vide this OM. It also mandates that the assessment of the Scientists from 01.01.2011 shall be done accordingly. The Modified Scheme also considers the ACR/APAR along annual work report to be submitted by the Scientists with the two levels of screening one internal and another external. What can be

considered as scientific activity is also elaborated in Annexure-I of the said scheme. Vide Annexure-II, the scientific post is the one, the incumbent of which is a Scientist or Engineer and is engaged in creating new scientific knowledge or innovative engineering, technological or medical techniques or which is involved predominantly in professional research work and development. The guidelines reiterated that only such scientists would be eligible for promotion who not only possess the requisite qualifications and are engaged in scientific and innovative activities as distinct from the mere application of technical knowledge and further the functions discharged by them are relatable/identifiable to their academic specialization. Subsequent to this, vide Annexure-A7, the respondents organisation has incorporated the Modified FCS by amending the ICFRE Group-A(Scientific Posts) Rules 2001 in which the same essential qualifications for Scientist-C and above is mentioned vide Annexure-I. The problem has apparently has been created by Annexure-A8 wherein in the garb of Frequently Asked Questions(FAQs), a specific answer is given under Sl.No.4 relating to the qualifications to be covered under FCS where it is mentioned as Master's degree in Natural/Agricultural Sciences or Bachelor's Degree in Engineering/Technology/Medicine. In Sl.No.5, which created the problem for the applicant, the DoPT has clarified that the qualifications like MCA, M.Sc. (Statistics), M.Sc.(Mathematics) etc. are not covered under the FCS. The respondents have tightly held to this interpretation and have come to the conclusion that the applicant is not eligible for consideration under the Modified FCS. The applicant has pointed out that the DoPT itself vide Annexure-A9 has

included the degrees of M.Sc.(Electronics) and M.Sc.(Applied Electronics) as subjects under Engineering equivalent to Bachelor's Degree in Engineering. In addition, he has also pointed out vide Annexure-A19 that G.B.Pant Institute of Himalayan Environment & Development, an institution under the same Ministry of Environment and Forests has covered all scientists including the scientists having qualification in Mathematics, Computer Science, Computer Application and Library Science to be considered for promotion to the next higher grades under the Modified FCS. He has given the instances of three scientists who have been promoted to the levels of Scientists-D & E with the qualifications of M.Sc. (Mathematics), MCA etc. The applicant has submitted Annexure-A12 wherein the respondents' institution had in fact recommended to the Ministry for considering the various other qualifications also for the purpose of MFCS. The applicant has urged that promotions under any scheme is part of the service conditions for the employees and he having been selected with the requisite qualifications as Scientist-B and having been promoted as Scientist-C also in the year 2009, he is entitled for further promotions as Scientist-D in the year 2013 and Scientist-E in the year 2017. As the rules for the scientists in this organisation that existed in the year 2001 and 2011 have given the qualifications which he has, the respondents cannot deny him the benefit of promotion. As per the rules vide Annexure-A7, a first class or equivalent Master's degree in Engineering Technology including the Computer Science or equivalent is enough to consider for promotion under MFCS. The applicant has an M.Tech. in Computer Application and by no stretch of imagination can this be considered as not being

an equivalent qualification prescribed as per the rules. The respondents cannot hide themselves behind the thin protection supposedly given by the FAQs at Annexure-A8 when the rules are very clear relating to the qualifications required for further promotions. As rightly contended by the applicant, the conditions of service cannot be altered to the disadvantage of the employees as ordered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Grid Corporation of Orissa and Ors vs. Rasanand Das* reported in (2003) 10 SCC 297 in Civil Appeal No.5525/2000 & others decided on 26.9.2003. The applicant has also brought in a number of cases to buttress his point that treating any guidelines as sacrosanct as law by the respondents is not a correct legal approach. We have to accept the contention of the applicant that the rules amended as per Annexure-A7 dtd.24.8.2011 issued by the 1st respondent is the appropriate legal point to be considered by us. The applicant has also had lengthily described the superiority of the qualification he has vis-a-vis M.Tech(Computer Science) and as rightly noted by him that M.Tech Computer Application and B.Tech etc. are offered by the Engineering or Technology Institutes whereas the MCAs are offered by the science and other degree colleges. Further, vide Annexure-A14, he has also given the details of the research accomplishments done by him qualifying him for further promotion.

11. We also agree with the applicant that whatever policy which the department would like to introduce with respect to the new rules brought in the year 2018 will be applicable only prospectively and not otherwise. It is clear that the applicant should be considered for the benefit he has applied for and therefore, we quash

Annexure-A11 and allow the applicant to be considered for assessment of Scientist for in-situ up-gradation under the Modified FCS for Scientist-C to D as well as from Scientist-D to E with respect to the years 2013 and 2017 based on the rules which are applicable to the applicant. The respondents are directed to issue necessary orders within a period of three(3) months from the date of issue of this order.

12. The OA is allowed with the above orders. No costs.

(C.V.SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

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

/ps/

Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA.No.170/00766/2018

Annexure-A1: The job advertisement by R1 dtd. 2001 for Scientists
Annexure-A2: The recruitment rules dtd.27.7.2001 for Scientists of the ICFRE
Annexure-A3: M.Sc(Mathematics) degree of the applicant dtd.1997
Annexure-A4: M.Tech(Computer Application) degree of the applicant dtd.2000
Annexure-A5: The applicant's appointment order dtd.3.4.2004 to Scientist-B post
Annexure-A6: Impugned OM of R3 dtd.10.9.2010
Annexure-A7: The RR 2011 of the ICFRE for the Scientists
Annexure-A8: Answers to the FAQ by R3 regarding the MFCS
Annexure-A9: R3's letter dtd.5.9.2013
Annexure-A10: R1's first order to the applicant's representation
Annexure-A11: R1's second order to the applicant's representation
Annexure-A12: The minutes of the 53rd meeting of ICFRE dtd.5.2.2016
Annexure-A13: Applicant's representation dtd.21.8.2017
Annexure-A14: Applicant's representation dtd.27.12.2017
Annexure-A15: The latest RRs 2018 dtd.24.1.2018 for the scientists of the ICFRE

Annexure-A16: The list of eligible Scientists dtd.17.4.2018 prepared by R1
Annexure-A17: The order dtd.5.5.2016 of CAT, Allahabad Bench

Annexures with reply statement:

Annexure-R1: Copy of the order dtd.23.8.2018
Annexure-R2: Copy of the order dtd.24.9.2018

Annexures with rejoinder:

Annexure-A18: The Supreme Court order (2003) 10 SCC 297
Annexure-A19: Promotion order dtd.11.8.2014 of Scientists
Annexure-A20: OM dtd.19.9.2016

Annexures with additional reply statement:

-NIL-

Annexures with written arguments note filed by the applicant:

-NIL-
