

OA.No.170/00349/2018/CAT/BANGALORE

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00349/2018

DATED THIS THE 02<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2019

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

**HON'BLE SHRI C.V. SANKAR, MEMBER (A)**

B.V. Hariprasad  
Aged about 49 years  
Working as Cameraman Gr. II  
At Doordarshan Kendra, Bangalore  
Residing at No. 33/1,  
Vadarahalli, Subhas Chandra Bose layout,  
Vidyaranyaपुरa,  
Bangalore – 560 097  
(By Advocate Shri N. Obalappa)

..... Applicant

Vs.

1. The Union of India,  
Represented by its Secretary,  
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting  
'A' Wing, Shastry Bhavan,  
New Delhi – 110 001

2. The Director,  
Ministry of Personal & Public Grievances & Pensions,  
(Dept. of Personnel & Training)  
North Block,  
New Delhi – 110 001

3. The Secretary,  
Union Public Service Commission,  
Dholpur House,  
New Delhi – 110 003

4. The Chief Executive Officer,  
Prasar Bharati, II Floor,  
PTI Building, Parliament Street,  
New Delhi – 110 001

5. The Director General,  
Doordarshan, Doordarshan Bhavan,  
Copernicus Marg,  
New Delhi – 110 001

6. The Dy. Director General (P)  
Doordarshan Kendra,  
J.C. Nagar,  
Bangalore – 560 006

....Respondents

(By Shri V.N. Holla, Counsel for Respondent No. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6)

### O R D E R (ORAL)

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

Heard. The matter seems to be covered by Parmar judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court and in terms of which we had passed an order in OA No. 894/2015 dated 31.10.2017 which we quote:

### “ORDER

(PER HON'BLE SHRI PRASANNA KUMAR PRADHAN, MEMBER (ADMN))

*Applicant has filed the OA seeking the following relief:*

*i. Quash and set aside the impugned communication bearing No.II/34/09/2014-Estt.A(CCU) dated 11.3.2015 (Annexure-A5) as unjust, arbitrary and unsustainable.*

*ii. Direct the third respondent to strict follow the decision of*

*Hon'ble Supreme Court in Parmar's case and revise the seniority in terms of the principles laid down therein as has been done by Mumbai and Goa Commissionerates without any further loss of time.*

2. The applicant submits that he appeared for the examination for the post of Inspector of Customs, Central Excise which was notified by the Staff Selection Commission in 1989 and having qualified in the written test held in 1989 and the interview conducted in March 1990, he was appointed as direct recruit vide order dated 28.11.1990. Thereafter he joined the Belgaum Commissionerate of the Central Excise on 10.12.1990. He referred to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar & others' case in the matter relating to inter-se seniority between direct recruits and promotee Inspectors and submits that the same has yet to be implemented by the respondent department. The applicant submits that the process of notification of vacancies of Inspectors through Staff Selection Commission by the Income Tax Department and Central Excise Department are analogous. The processes adopted by both the departments are common. Whatever decisions are applicable to Income Tax Department are equally applicable to the Central Excise Department in toto. Both the Departments come within the Department of Revenue of Ministry of Finance. Therefore, the inter-se seniority of the applicant vis-à-vis the promote Inspectors ought to have been determined with reference to the notification of vacancies to the SSC in the year 1989.

3. According to the applicant, following the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case, a communication was sent on 23.5.2013 by 2nd respondent to all the Chief Commissioners of Central Excise and Cadre Controlling Authorities(Annexure-A1) to examine the matter and to have their views. Thereafter, the Central Board of Excise and Customs issued a communication dated 8.9.2014(Annexure-A2) to all Cadre Controlling Authorities to take further action looking into the facts of the case read with DoP&T OM dated 4.3.2014 and clarifications. The Commissioner of Customs(General), Mumbai issued a circular dated 27.9.2014(Annexure-A3) publishing the final common seniority list of Inspectors of Mumbai and Goa Customs strictly in accordance with the direction of Hon'ble High Court of Mumbai as well as the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court dated 27.11.2012 in UOI vs. N.R.Parmar & others. However, the 3rd respondent did not take any action in the matter of implementation of the judgment of N.R.Parmar in Karnataka region. Thereafter, the applicant submitted representation on 16.10.2014 requesting for granting him seniority in the case of Inspector of Central Excise from the date of initiation of recruitment process i.e. 1988- 1989(Annexure-A4). However, the 3rd respondent vide his communication dated 11.3.2015 rejected the representation of the applicant as well as others. Hence the present OA.

4. The applicant submits that the 3rd respondent should have undertaken the determination of inter-se seniority based on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 27.11.2012 in N.R.Parmar & others and the direction issued by the DoP&T following the said judgment. New Delhi zone has also published the draft seniority list by implementing the judgment in N.R.Parmar's case. But the 3rd respondent has rejected the representation of the applicant and others stating that there was no change in the procedure adopted for fixation of seniority after 3.3.2008 and therefore it does not call for any review. Consequently the applicant suffers loss in seniority as the inter-se seniority of direct recruit and promote has not been revised based on the principle laid down in N.R.Parmar's case. Therefore, he prayed for granting the relief as sought for.

5. The respondents have filed a reply statement in which they have referred to DoP&T OM dated 22.12.1959(Annexure-R1) & 7.2.1986(Annexure-R2) and consolidated instructions dated 3.7.1986(Annexure-R3) and submit that the seniority of direct recruits and promote Inspectors available every year(i.e. who were appointed during the year) was fixed by rotating them to the extent it was possible to rotate in the ratio prescribed in the RR and the excess DRs or promotes who have joined during the year were bunched together and placed en-bloc below the last DR/Promotee. In pursuant to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court dated 27.11.2012 in the case of N.R.Parmar & others, the DoP&T vide OM No.20011/1/2012-Estt(D) dated 4.3.2014(AnnexureR5)has issued instructions at para 5 regarding fixation of inter-se seniority. Inter alia, it has been communicated that DOPT's OM No.20011/1/2006-Estt(D) dated 3.3.2008 is treated as non-existent/withdrawn ab initio; the available direct recruits and promotes for assignment of inter-se seniority refer to the direct recruits and promotes who are appointed against the vacancies of a recruitment year; recruitment year would be the year of initiating the recruitment process against a vacancy year. Further, at para5(h) of the said OM, it is stated that the principles for determination of inter-se seniority of direct recruits and promotes would be effective from 27.11.2012, the date of Hon'ble Supreme court judgment in Civil Appeal No.7514-7515/2005 in the case of N.R.Parmar vs. UOI & Ors. Also, at para 5(i) it is stated that the cases of seniority already settled with reference to the applicable interpretation of the term availability, as contained in DOPT OM dated 7.2.86/3.7.86 may not be reopened. The inter-se seniority in the case of the applicant between the promotes were fixed with reference to his date of appointment as per the procedure followed since 1986 in terms of the DOPT's OM dated 7.2.86/3.7.86. The principles laid down in the OM dated 4.3.2014 was effective from 27.11.2012, hence the representation submitted by the applicant for re-fixation of his seniority was rejected in a common letter dated 11.3.2015 disposing

*of similar representations received from the Inspectors.*

6. *The respondents further submitted that as per the procedure followed for fixation of seniority of direct recruits and promotes since 1986, the applicant's inter-se seniority was fixed with reference to the date of appointment. The principles laid down in the OM are applicable w.e.f. 27.11.2012 whereas the date of appointment of the applicant being 1990, his case is much before the said date. Referring to the circular issued by the Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai, they submit that seniority list was prepared pursuant to the order passed by the High Court/ Hon'ble CAT, Mumbai. The facts of the said case are not available. Further 3rd respondent has followed the instructions laid down by the DOPT in the above OMs/Clarificatory letter issued in pursuance to the judgment dated 27.11.2012 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. As stated at Para 6 of the impugned letter dated 11.3.2015, the manner of fixation of interse seniority in respect of DRs and promotes prior to the issue of DOPT's OM dated 3.3.2008 and after the issue of the OM dated 3.3.2008 remained the same and there was no change in the procedure adopted for fixation of seniority after 3.3.2008 i.e. the inter-se seniority of DRs and promotes has been fixed in terms of the DOPT OM dated 7.2.86/3.7.86 from the year 1986 up to the period 2011-12.*

7. *The respondents further submitted that in Karnataka zone as per the applicable/implied interpretation of the OMs dated 7.2.86/3.7.86, the seniority of available DR Inspectors appointed in a year has been fixed by rotating them with the available promote Inspectors promoted during the year to the extent it was possible to rotate in the ratio prescribed in the RR and excess DRs or promotes who were appointed/promoted during the year were bunched together and placed below the last DR/promote rotated. Hence, there was no change over in the manner of fixation of seniority after 3.3.2008 which confirmed the above manner of fixation of seniority. Although OM dated 3.3.2008 has to be treated as non-existent in pursuance to the Supreme Court's judgment in the case of N.R.Parmar, in view of the facts that there was no change over in the manner of fixation of seniority prior and after 3.3.2008, and also of the fact that the seniority was fixed up to 27.11.2012 as per the applicable interpretation of the OM dated 7.2.86/3.7.86, the applicant as well as other Inspectors who had submitted representations for re-fixation of seniority were informed vide this office common letter dated 11.3.2015 that no revision was called for in the seniority and that their requests cannot be acceded to. The said stand of this office is in conformity with the instructions issued by the DOPT. Therefore, they submit that the contention of the applicant does not merit any consideration.*

8. *The applicant has filed a rejoinder in which he referred to the reply saying that the seniority of direct recruits and promote Inspectors is fixed based on availability in a year i.e. who are*



*appointed during the year and submit that in terms of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the seniority ought to be counted in the year in which the recruitment process commenced or in other words the years in which the requisition is sent to the recruiting agency and not the examination year or the year in which the person is appointed. Assigning seniority to the direct recruits with reference to the date of actual appointment in the Income Tax Department is incorrect and cannot be accepted. In the case of the applicant the process of recruitment in his case commenced in 1988-89 and hence his seniority should be fixed at the relevant place in 1988-89 and not in the year 1990 when the applicant was actually appointed.*

9. *Referring to the contention of the respondents that the applicant was appointed prior to 27.11.2012, the applicant submits that they have referred to the judgment of Lucknow Bench of this Tribunal in OA.No.118/2013 dated 18.4.2014 wherein the Tribunal directed that the respondents are bound to follow the principle decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case as the law as settled by the Court is clearly in favour of the applicants(Annexure-A6).*

10. *Applicant also submits that the Chief Commissionerate of Central Excise, Shillong Zone has issued draft seniority list dated 23.2.2016(Annexure-A7) revising the seniority of Inspectors of Shillong Zone based on the direction of the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case. Therefore, the 3rd respondent ought to undertake similar revision in the matter of seniority. Subsequently the applicant had filed a memo containing several orders passed by different Benches of the Tribunal viz. Principal Bench, Ernakulam Bench, Ahmedabad Bench and Chennai Bench in support of his contention.*

11. *Heard the Learned Counsel for the parties. The Learned Counsel for the applicant while highlighting the submissions made in the OA and rejoinder submits that following the judgment in N.R.Parmar's case and direction of the DOPT, several commissionerates in Central Excise have already taken steps for revising the seniority list based on the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case. The Income Tax department which is a sister organisation and come under the same Department of Revenue has also undertaken similar exercise for reviewing the seniority list. Therefore, the stand of the 3rd respondent by not considering such revision of seniority in Karnataka Region is unjustified. Therefore, he prayed for direction on the 3rd respondent for undertaking revision of seniority list based on the principle laid down in N.R.Parmar's case.*

12. *The Learned Counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, while highlighting the submission made in the reply statement states that the interse seniority in case of the applicant vis-à-vis the promotes was fixed with reference to the date of appointment as per*

*the procedure followed since 1986 in terms of the DOPT's OM dated 7.2.86/3.7.86. The determination of inter-se seniority of direct recruits and promotes based on the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case in Civil Appeal No.7514-7515/2005 would be effective from 27.11.2012 and hence the earlier case need not be reopened. Regarding the circular issued by the Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai, he had referred to the orders passed by the High Court/ Hon'ble CAT Mumbai and hence would not be relevant to the Karnataka region. He further submitted that there is no change in the procedure adopted for fixation of inter-se seniority after DOPT OM dated 3.3.2008 which was struck down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in its judgement in N.R.Parmar's case. The representation submitted by the applicant as well as other Inspectors was examined by the respondents and vide letter dated 11.3.2015 it was clearly stated that no revision in the seniority list was called for and their requests cannot be acceded to. Therefore, he submits that there is no need for any revision in the seniority list as contended by the applicant.*

13. We have carefully considered the facts of the case and submissions made by either side. The matter pertains to fixation of inter-se seniority between direct recruits and promotes following the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.7514-7515/2005 in N.R.Parmar & others' case. Para33 & 34 of the order dtd.27.11.2012 in CA.No.7514-7515/2005 states as follows:

33. Having interpreted the effect of the OMs dated 7.2.1986 and 3.7.1986 (in paragraphs 20 and 21 hereinabove), we are satisfied, that not only the requisition but also the advertisement for direct recruitment was issued by the SSC in the recruitment year in which direct recruit vacancies had arisen. The said factual position, as confirmed by the rival parties, is common in all matters being collectively disposed of. In all these cases the advertised vacancies were filled up in the original/first examination/selection conducted for the same. None of the direct recruit Income Tax Inspectors herein can be stated to be occupying carried forward vacancies, or vacancies which came to be filled up by a "later" examination/selection process. The facts only reveal, that the examination and the selection process of direct recruits could not be completed within the recruitment year itself. For this, the modification/amendment in the manner of determining the inter-se seniority between the direct recruits and promotes, carried out through the OM dated 7.2.1986, and the compilation of the instructions pertaining to seniority in the OM dated 3.7.1986, leave no room for any doubt, that the "rotation of quotas" principle, would be fully applicable to the direct recruits in the present controversy. The direct recruits herein will therefore have to be interspaced with promotes of the same recruitment year.

34. In view of the above, the Civil Appeals, the Transferred Case, as well as, the Transfer Case (filed by the direct recruits and the Union of India) are hereby allowed. The claim of the promotes, that the direct recruit Income Tax Inspectors, in the instant case should be assigned seniority with reference to the date of their actual appointment in the Income Tax Department is declined.

14. Following the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the above said case and the circular issued by the DOPT, there were circulars issued by the CBDT & CBEC i.e. Central Board of Direct Taxes and Central Board of Excise and Customs. The matter of revision of seniority list based on N.R.Parmar's judgment was agitated by officials of both the Income Tax department as well as Customs Department in various Tribunals. Reference has been made by the applicant to the decision of Lucknow Bench of the Tribunal in OA.No.118/2013 wherein a direction was issued to the respondents to recast the seniority list based on the principles laid in N.R.Parmar's case. Similar directions were issued by the Principle Bench vide its order dated 12.5.2014 in OA.No.1854/2013. Both pertains to Income Tax department but the principle remains same. This Tribunal in a case pertaining to Income Tax Inspector where similar issue was raised also gave a direction vide its order dated 28.1.2014 in OA.No.960-979/2013 to the respondents for recasting the seniority list following the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case and the same was implemented by the respondents also.

15. The Ernakulam Bench in its order dated 16.11.2015 in OA.No.611/2009 and the Ahmedabad Bench of the Tribunal in its order dated 15.12.2015 in OA.No.405/2014 etc. gave similar direction and it pertains to Customs & Central Excise Department. The applicant also produced revised seniority list prepared by the Central Excise, Customs & Service Tax of Mumbai and Shillong region based on the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case. During the hearing, the Learned Counsel for the applicant produced an order of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in WP.No.5611- 5613/2017 pertaining to Central Board of Excise and Customs wherein vide para 12,13 & 21 of its order dtd.25.4.2017 it is observed as follows:

12. The Department of Personnel and Training made it clear that the seniority already settled with reference to Office Memorandum dated 7.2.1986 and 3.7.1986 would not be reopened. The representation submitted by the employees was rejected only on the ground that in view of the circular, it would not be possible to re-open the seniority already settled, with reference to the applicable interpretation of the term "availability".



13. *It is a matter of record that in spite of the Office Memorandum dated 4.3.2014, the Central Excise Commissionerate of Delhi, Mumbai and Shillong, have amended the seniority list of Inspectors with retrospective effect.*

21. *The Central Board of Excise and Customs is the Apex body and the Commissionerates are all working under the said body. It would not be proper for the Central board of Excise and Customs, to challenge the order passed by the Tribunal extending the benefits to the employees of the Chennai Commissionerate, after implementing similar orders passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal in the case of employees of Mumbai Commissionerate and giving revised seniority in accordance with the judgment in N.R.Parmar in the case of employees of Delhi Commissionerate even without an order passed by the Tribunal or High Court. The Central Board of Excise and Customs must adopt a policy, uniform to all its employees irrespective of the Commissionerate. There cannot be a different policy, one for the Commissionerate at Delhi and another for Chennai. The Discriminatory attitude shown by the Central board of Excise and Customs made the employees to approach the Central Administrative Tribunal and that too to implement the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The initiation of writ petitions is an exercise in futility. There is absolutely no merit in any of the contentions taken by the writ petitioners.*

16. *The Ernakulam Bench of the Tribunal in its order dated 16.11.2015 in OA.No.611/2009 observed vide para-14 to 17 as follows:*

14. *The Apex Court also held that O.M. dated 03.03.2008 must be deemed to be non-est to the extent that the same is in derogation of earlier O.Ms dated 07.02.1986 and 03.07.1986 and has to be ignored/omitted to the extent that the same is in derogation of these earlier O.Ms. Based on the above observation of the Apex Court in Parmar's case, the Bombay Bench drew the conclusion that so far as the issue of determination of seniority between direct recruits and promote officers appointed in any department is concerned, post the Parmar judgment, the same is strictly governed by the provisions of OM dated 07.02.1986 and 03.07.1986 by following the rota quota principle and direct recruits are to be inter-spaced with the promote officers at appropriate slots in the seniority list in reference to their recruitment year, which is nothing but the year in which the recruitment process was initiated by notifying the vacancies to be filled. Although it may take a couple of years to complete the said selection process.*

*Date of joining by the direct recruits subsequently in pursuance thereof, is immaterial for determining their seniority vis-à-vis the promote officers.*

*15. Based on the above precedent of the Apex Court in the Parmar's case and the Bombay Bench judgment supra the respondents are directed to revise the seniority list suitably so as to inter space the direct recruit applicant with the promote officers at appropriate slots on the basis of their recruitment year and not on the basis of the date when they have actually joined service.*

*16. The Bombay Bench also considered the retrospective application of the Parmar's judgment by stating that every judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is the law of the land and it is always retrospective in operation unless it is specifically directed by the Court itself in the judgment that the decision will have prospective application only. There is nothing in the judgment in Parmar's case which intends that the judgment should have only prospective application. The Bench also observed that the judgment is in rem i.e. applicable to all similarly situated and not in personam i.e. applicable to the parties involved therein only.*

*17. The respondents are directed to notionally assign and fix the seniority of the applicant with reference to date of initiation of the process of recruitment and in terms of the rotation of quota principle and operate the revised seniority list when promotions are effected to the next promotion post.*

*16. Similarly the Ahmedabad Bench of the Tribunal in its order dated 15.12.2015 in OA.No.405/2014 observed vide para-21 as follows:*

*21. OA thus resultantly succeeds. The impugned orders are quashed and set aside. A fresh seniority list be drawn in the light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case taking into consideration applicants seniority from 2003 vis-à-vis the promotee officers promoted in 2003. They may be accordingly interspaced with promote officers. If DPCs for further promotion have been held disregarding their revised seniority, they stand invalidated. Future DPCs to be held taking into consideration this new seniority. However, there shall be no other dilution or modification in the rules concerning their promotion. Parties will bear their own cost of litigation. OA allowed.*

*17. As would be evident from the above, this particular issue has already been considered by various Benches of this Tribunal and*

*directions were issued on the respondents to revise the seniority list based on the principle laid down by the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case. The Mumbai and Shillong zones have already revised the seniority list based on the same principle. Though it could not be indicated by both sides in respect of the position in other zones, we are fully in agreement with the observations made and orders passed by other Benches of the Tribunal. We therefore hold that based on the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's case, the respondents shall revise the seniority list suitably so as to interspace the direct recruits and promote officers with retrospective effect on the basis of recruitment year and not on the basis of their joining the service. The 3rd respondent is accordingly directed to take further steps for revising the seniority list in accordance with the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in N.R.Parmar's judgment within a period of three(3) months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.*

18. The OA is accordingly, allowed in terms of the aforesaid direction. No order as to costs."

2. **We had clearly held that the matter seems to be covered by the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the Parmar's case and in terms of which the matter has to be taken up by all.** On the other hand, Shri V.N. Holla, learned counsel for the respondents, relies on an order of the Principal Bench which had been disposed off on twin grounds of non-joinder of necessary parties and also the issue of limitation. But when once the Hon'ble Apex Court had laid down the law on the subject, all other things pale into insignificance. We had carefully gone through the judgment of the Principal Bench so cited and it is noted that persons who do not possess the requisite qualification but fully unrelated qualification including matric, higher secondary, B.Sc., B.Com, M.A. etc have been shown above them as Cameraman Grade II and Cameraman Grade I officers. This is significant departure from the process available in that particular department. Cameraman is a technical proposition and his qualifications are determined

on the basis of his ability as a cameraman and not as a general clerk. Therefore, the basis of the finding of the Principal Bench is itself suspect. The second element which is pointed out to us is that the seniority rule of 1987 had been apparently vitiated by the regularization of Cameraman Grade II even though a proposal was there for direct recruitment of them. This also was done through judicial interdiction and it appears to us as highly improper for us to question the regularization after decades have passed. Relating to the element that Staff Artists had been converted into government servants from the date of their appointment, it appears to be a policy decision taken by the government following the intervention of the Hon'ble Apex Court in several cases and, therefore, we have no hesitation to hold that this judgment of the Principal Bench cited by the respondents do not hold the field.

3. The issue is squarely covered by the Parmar judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court and since the Hon'ble Apex Court had laid down the law on which applicant or others like them have been granted a benefit, the question of delay which is canvassed by four other judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court relating to delay cannot have the field as the matter had been directly dealt with by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the Parmar's case.

4. At this point of time, the applicant points out that he is actually a direct recruitee and nothing to do with the Cameraman's issue. Even the Cameraman's issue we hold is against the respondents. But since applicant is also a direct recruitee, he will squarely come under the protection of Parmar's judgment and nothing else.

5. The OA is allowed. Benefits, if any, to be made available within two months next. No order as to costs.

(C.V. SANKAR)

MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)

MEMBER (J)

/ksk/

**Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA No. 170/00349/2018**

Annexure-A1: Copy of the order on joining of the applicant at DDK, Guwahati dated 09.11.1989

Annexure-A2: Copy of the OM dated 27.12.1990

Annexure-A3: Copy of the OM dated 14.09.1993

Annexure-A4: Copy of the UPSC Gazettee Notification dated 03.11.1995

Annexure-A5: Copy of the 5<sup>th</sup> CPC pay scale of Cameraman Gr II revised to Rs. 6500-10500

Annexure-A6: Copy of the clarification dated 06.02.1998 for filling of the post of Cameraman Gr-II

Annexure-A7: Copy of the DoPT clarifications for amendment of the recruitment rules of Cameraman

Annexure-A8: Copy of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench order dated 01.01.1999

Annexure-A9: Copy of the Corrigendum dated 28.06.2013

Annexure-A10: Copy of the order dated 22.08.2013, Amendment Rules of Cameraman Gr-II

Annexure-A11: Copy of the circular dated 12.08.2015

Annexure-A12: Copy of the representation of the applicant dated 21.11.2016

Annexure-A13: Copy of the applicant's reminder to his representation dated 02.04.2018

**Annexures referred in reply**

Nil



**Annexures referred in rejoinder**

Annexure-A14: Copy of the OM dated 07.02.1986

Annexure-A15: Copy of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7514-7515 of 2005

Annexure-A16: Copy of the OM dated 04.03.2014 – inter se seniority of direct recruits and promotees

Annexure-A17: Copy of the OM dated 16.05.2018 – final seniority list of Cameraman Grade-I

Annexure-A18: Copy of the Gazette Notification, Prasar Bharati dated 20.02.2013

\* \* \* \* \*