

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BABU MATHEW P.JOSEPH

TUESDAY, THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/9TH ASHADHA, 1937

OP(KAT).No. 115 of 2015 (Z)

AGAINST THE ORDER IN OA 1594/2014 of KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DATED 29-12-2014

PETITIONERS:

1. HYDROSS POTTENGAL AGED 47 YEARS
S/O.MUHAMMED P, ASSISTANT FIELD OFFICER
VETERINARY DISPENSARY, THOZHANNUR CHENEKKAL
RANDATHANI P.O., MALAPPURAM DISTRICT
RESIDING AT POTTENGAL HOUSE, KALAPANKANCHERRY P.O.
MALAPPURAM.
2. RAMESH M. AGED 48 YEARS
S/O.MANIKKAN, ASSISTANT FIELD OFFICER
ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROL PROJECT OFFICE, WAYANAD
KALPETTA-673 121, RESIDING AT NELLIYAMPADAM HOUSE
T.B.ROAD, EMILY, KALPETTA NORTH P.O.
WAYANAD-673 122.

BY ADV. SRI.KALEESWARAM RAJ

RESPONDENTS:

1. MADHUSOODANAN E.V., AGED 46 YEARS
S/O.LATE KUNHAMBU NAMBIAR
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GRADE-II, ICDPS SUB CENTRE
VALIAPOYIL, KASARAGOD-671 313
RESIDING AT PERINGETH HOUSE, P.O.PILICODE
KASARAGOD-671 310.
2. SURESHKUMAR P.R., AGED 48 YEARS
S/O.RAJAPPAN, LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GRADE-II
ICDPS SUB CENTRE, PERUVAYAL, PERUMANNA P.O.
KOZHIKODE-673 016, RESIDING AT ARCHANA
KOTTAMPARAMBU P.O., KOZHIKODE-673 008.

3. JAGESH KUMAR V.V. AGED 43 YEARS
S/O.O.P.VELAYUDHAN, LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GRADE-II
ICDP SUB CENTRE, CHELIYA, CHENGOTTUKAVU
KOYLANDI, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT, RESIDING AT OMKARAM
MELUR, CHENGOTTUKAVU, KOYILANDY
KOZHIKODE-673 306.
4. ALPHONESE T., AGED 50 YEARS
S/O.LATE T.D.THOMAS, LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GRADE-II
ICDPS SUB CENTRE, KOCHU THOVLA, P.O.KOCHU THOVALA
KATTAPPANA, IDUKKI-685 508, RESIDING AT THEYINKAL
SEETHATHODE P.O., PATHANAMTHITTA-689 667.
5. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AGRICULTURE (ANIMAL HUSBANDRY E), DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.
6. THE DIRECTOR
ANIMAL HUSBANDRY DEPARTMENT, VIKAS BHAVAN
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 033.
7. RENJITH KUMAR
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE, PARATHUR
MALAPURAM-679 303.
8. PRATHEESH GOPI
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, DISTRICT POULTRY FARM, ATHAVANAD
MALAPPURAM-676 301.
9. PRASAD KOORIKKARRIL
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY
PULAMANTHOLE, MALAPPURAM-679 323.
10. NEELAKANDAN P.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
ARAKKAPARAMBA, MALAPPURAM-679 329.
11. BINDU P.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
THAZHEKKOD, MALAPPURAM-676 505.
12. REENA A
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY, KEEZATOOR
M MALAPPURAM-673 639.

13. SIRAJ MUHAMMED
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY
VETTIKATTIRI, MALAPPURAM-676 521.
14. LATHIKA K.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY POLY CLINIC, TIRUR
MALAPPURAM-676 101.
15. MANOJ KUMAR K.M.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
PULAMANTHOLE, MALAPPURAM-679 323.
16. PRADEEP KUMAR P.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
NANNAMBRA, MALAPPURAM-676 320.
17. MINI B.K.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY
VETTATHUR, MALAPPURAM-679 326.
18. VINOD B.K.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY
ANAGDIPPURAM, MALAPPURAM-679 321.
19. ABDUL KARIM
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
POOKATTUMADAM, MALAPPURAM-679 332.
20. VIJAYAN K.M.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE, PONNANI
MALAPPURAM-679 576.
21. JOBY JOSEPH
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
IRUMBUZHI, MALAPPURAM-676 509.
22. SHAIJU N.B.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
VELIYANKODE, MALAPPURAM-679 579.
23. HARIS V.P.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY, VETTATHUR
MALAPPURAM-679 326.
24. MADHUSOODANAN O.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
CHEMBRESSERY, MALAPPURAM-679 513.
25. STHEPHEN
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY
VELIYANCODE, MALAPPURAM-679 579.

26. SULAIMAN K.P.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY DISPENSARY, OMANNOR
MALAPPURAM-679 645.
27. SAJEEVAN V.K.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY HOSPITAL, VALANCHERY
MALAPPURAM-679 552.
28. WILSON JOHN
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
PATTARNADAKAVU, MALAPPURAM-679 301.
29. SAIJU C MATHEW
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
KUTTIPURAM, MALAPPURAM-71.
30. BINDU K.V.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY HOSPITAL, VATTAMKALAM
MALAPPURAM-78.
31. SAIJU ABRAHAM
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
CHIRATTAMALA, MALAPPURAM-679 338.
32. BINOY JACOB
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
EDAYUR SOUTH, MALAPPURAM-679 552.
33. RAJEEV V.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GR-I, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
NJANGATTIRI, VIA PATTAMBI, PALAKKAD-679 303.
34. SURESH BABU
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GR-I, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
VILAYOOR, PALAKKAD-679 309.
35. JAGATHIJEEVAN T.K.
LIVE STOCK INSPECTOR GR-I, VETERINARY SUB CENTRE
THENKURUSSY, PALAKKAD-678 593.

R 5 & 6 BY SR. GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI M. MUHAMMED SHAFI

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 30-06-2015 ALONG WITH O.P. KAT NO. 100 OF 2015, THE COURT
ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

OP(KAT).No. 115 of 2015 (Z)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS

EXT.P1. TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 26/9/2014 IN TA NO.2150/2012.

EXT.P2. TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29/12/2014 IN OA NO.1594/2014.

EXT.P3. TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF TA 2150/2012 IN WPC
NO.15703/2009 TOGETHER WITH EXHIBITS.

EXT.P4. TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT
IN TA NO.2150/2012.

EXT.P5. TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT IN TA
NO.2150/2012.

EXT.P6. TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS 4
TO 8 IN TA NO.2150/2012.

EXT.P7. TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS 12
AND 13 IN TA NO.2150/2012.

EXT.P8. TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF OA 1594/2014

EXT.P9. TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED IN OA 1594/2014.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL

KS.

True copy

P.S. (Hr.Gr.)To Judge

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON
&
BABU MATHEW P. JOSEPH, JJ.**

=====

O.P.(KAT)Nos. 100 & 115 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 30th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

P.R. Ramachandra Menon,J.

These original petitions have been filed by the very same petitioners being aggrieved of the orders passed by the Kerala Administrative Tribunal in T.A.No.2150 of 2012 and O.A. No. 1594 of 2014; whereby a stalemate has been resulted in so far as the benefit due to the petitioners as per the order dated 26.9.2014 in T.A. No.2150 of 2012 has been virtually taken away by the subsequent order dated 29.12.2014 in O.A. No.1594 of 2014 restricting the scope of consideration despite the

observation and direction in the former order to the effect that all the issues were left open to be considered by the concerned Authority. Since the issue involved in both the cases is similar and closely interconnected, they are taken up and considered together. The pleadings and proceedings are referred to, as given in O.P.(KAT) No.100 of 2015.

2. The dispute is mainly with regard to the seniority of Livestock Inspectors Grade-II. The petitioners herein, on completion of the selection process by the PSC, came to be appointed to the above posts, way back in the year 1996. After the above exercise, another notification was issued in respect of vacancies in the same of Live Stock Inspectors Gr.II. The selection proceedings were finalised and advices were given, pursuant to which the persons concerned joined the service. In the meanwhile, the mistake committed by the Public Service Commission in omitting to consider the claim of the dependents of ex-servicemen in respect of their quota required to be rectified. Therefore, necessary corrective measures were

taken by the PSC and a revised list was issued, re-fixing the seniority, allotting appropriate place to the persons concerned, who were eligible in respect of the ex-service quota. Based on the said revised list, proceedings were finalised by the Director by issuing appropriate orders, which according to the petitioners herein very much adversely affected their rights and interest. This was sought to be challenged by filing W.P.(C) No.15703 of 2009 before this Court; which was subsequently transferred to the Kerala Administrative Tribunal, where it was re-numbered as T.A. 2150 of 2012.

3. While so, some other persons, who came to be appointed subsequently, approached the Government by way of appeal, pointing out that the seniority given to the persons who came to be appointed subsequently, was not correct or proper in the eye of law. The matter was considered by the Government in detail and it was observed that re-fixation of the seniority by the Director based on the revised advice memo issued by the PSC was perfectly in order, in so far as it was in conformity with

Rule 27(c) of Part II of the Kerala State & Subordinate Services Rules (for short, KS & SSR). However, the Government observed that, before issuance of such proceedings by the Director, an opportunity of hearing was to be given to the affected parties and hence, it was liable to be reconsidered. The said order bearing No. 1067/2014AD dated 23.6.2014 is produced as Annexure A3 in the OP(KAT) 100 of 2015.

4. When T.A. 2150 of 2012 preferred by the petitioners came up for consideration before the Tribunal on 26.9.2014, it was observed that, by virtue of Annexure A-3 order dated 23.6.2014 passed by the Government, the matter had been ordered to be reconsidered by the Director and in the said circumstances, it was very much open to the applicants to pursue the matter pursuant to the revision of the list to be effected either by the Government or by the Director, Animal Husbandry. All the issues were left open and the matter was disposed of accordingly, as per order dated 26.9.2014. The said order is produced as Annexure A1 in O.P.(KAT)No.100 of

2015.

5. While so, it came to the notice of the petitioners that the course and proceedings ordered to be finalised as per Annexure A1, and the effect of the said order passed by the Kerala Administrative Tribunal had virtually come to be nullified, as per the subsequent order of the Tribunal in O.A. No.1594 of 2014 (a copy of which has been produced as Annexure A-2 in O.P.(KAT No.100 of 2015) whereby Annexure A-9 order passed by the Government was set aside, holding that in so far as the Government had arrived at a finding that the proceedings of the Director were in conformity with the mandate of Rule 27(c) of the KS & SSR, it was not at all necessary for the matter to be reconsidered, after hearing the other persons concerned, which otherwise would only be a futile exercise. After setting aside the said order, the Tribunal observed as follows:

"But we think, a post-decisional hearing by the Director will redress the grievance of the contesting party respondents. They can bring to the notice of the Director the other illegalities in

the list, other than the revision of seniority based on the revised advice list furnished by the Public Service Commission."

By virtue of the said order, it is contended by the petitioners herein, that the relief already extended to them as per Annexure A1 order passed by the Tribunal with liberty to challenge the revised list to be issued by the Government/Director, leaving all the issues open, has been unreasonably restricted. The challenge is raised also pointing out that no opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioners herein, as they were never made parties to the subsequent O.A. No. 1594 of 2014. It is in the said circumstances, that Annexure A1 order has been sought to be challenged in O.P.(KAT)No.100 of 2015, while Annexure A2 is under challenge in O.P.(KAT)No.115 of 2015.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Senior Government Pleader and the learned Standing Counsel for the PSC at length. After going through the pleadings and proceedings, it is seen that the petitioners herein had sought to challenge the

proceedings of the Government/Director and also of the PSC, with regard to the revised seniority list, by filing W.P.(C) No.15703 of 2009; which was subsequently transferred to the Kerala Administrative Tribunal, where it was renumbered as T.A. No. 2150 of 2012. The prayers in the writ petition are as follows:

- i) issue a writ of certiorari quashing Ext.P3 to the extent it seeks clarification and explanations from the 3rd respondent,*
- ii) Issue a writ of certiorari quashing Ext.P6 as unjust, illegal and arbitrary.*
- iii) Issue a writ of certiorari quashing Ext.P7 as unjust, illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable.*
- iv) To declare that the petitioners are entitled to reckon their seniority as contained in Ext.P5.*
- v) To declare that the candidates who are included in the rank list on the basis of Ext.P1 will be entitled to reckon their seniority with effect from the date of effective advice.*
- vi) To declare that the action of the 3rd respondent in preparing district wise combined seniority list of Livestock Inspector Grade-II is unjust, illegal, arbitrary and ultra vires.*

vii) To issue a writ of mandamus directing that respondents to give consequential benefits to the petitioner including promotion on the basis of their seniority finalised as per Ext.P5.

viii) To issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to refrain from implementing Exts.P6 or P7.

ix) To grant such other reliefs as this Honourable Court may deem fit and proper."

7. It was after considering the above pleadings and prayers, that the Tribunal disposed of the T.A. with liberty to challenge the revised seniority to be issued by the Government/Director pursuant to Annexure-A3 order dated 23.6.2014 issued by the Government, leaving all the issues open. The operative portion of the said verdict as contained in Annexure A-1 reads as follows:

"In view of the said development, this Transferred Application is closed. In case, the applicants are aggrieved by the fresh list that is going to be published by the Government or under the directions of the Government by the Director of Animal Husbandry, they will be free to challenge

the same. The closure of this Transferred Application will not affect the contentions raised by them herein. In case occasion arises for them to challenge the new list, they will be free to raise all contentions available to them including those they have raised in this Transferred Application. If the Government proposes to hear the appellants before it while taking a final decision, the applicants and other affected persons shall also be given an opportunity of being heard."

The question is whether any adverse circumstance has been resulted by virtue of the subsequent order passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No. 1594 of 2014 i.e. Annexure A-2; that too, without hearing the petitioners.

6. Evidently, as discussed hereinbefore, vide Annexure A-2 order dated 29.12.2014, the Tribunal set aside Annexure A-9 order dated 23.6.2014 passed by the Government, however, directing the 'Director' to consider other objections, if at all to be preferred by the party respondents, restricting such scope of consideration on all points "except with regard to service seniority". This

means, the Director is not in a position to make any modification based on the liberty granted in Annexure A-1 verdict and as such, there is no chance for the grievance of the petitioners to get redressed, if they have got a sustainable case in accordance with law. Going by the nature of the proceedings, this Court finds that there cannot be any challenge with regard to Annexure A-1 verdict, in so far as it only directs the matter to be considered by the Government leaving all the issues open. By virtue of the subsequent proceedings/Annexure A2, the rights and liberties stand curtailed much.

9. Admittedly, the petitioners have not brought the effect of the conflicting directions as contained in Annexures A1 and A2 to the notice of the Tribunal. The fact remains that the petitioners were never parties to the proceedings in the subsequent O.A. wherein Annexure A2 order was passed. The rights given as per Annexure A1 order enabling to challenge the proceedings, if adverse, on all grounds stand curtailed by virtue of Annexure A2 order. This is a matter which is to be considered and set

right by the Tribunal at the first instance. The petitioners are set at liberty to file appropriate proceedings by way of petition for review before the Tribunal, so as to meet the situation, notwithstanding the bar of limitation, if any, with reference to Rule 21 of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Practice & Procedure) Rules. In the above circumstances, the petitioners are permitted to file appropriate proceedings as above and they are given two weeks' time in this regard. If appropriate review petitions are filed before the Tribunal within 'two weeks' from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment, the matter is required to be considered and finalised on merits in accordance with law, after hearing all the interested parties. 'Status quo' shall be maintained with regard to the direction given as per Annexures A1 and A2 till such time.

Both the Original Petitions are disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON
JUDGE

JOSEPH

ks.

**Sd/-
BABU MATHEW P.**

JUDGE

True copy

P.S. (Hr.Gr.)To Judge

