

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.11.2016

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE S.MANIKUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE N.AUTHINATHAN

W.P.No.35119 of 2012

M.P.No.1 of 2012

R.Sooriaprebha

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Under Secretary to Government,
Department of Personnel & Administrative
Reforms, Chief Secretariat,
Government of Puducherry,
Puducherry, Representing Union of India,

2.The Registrar,
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench, Chennai.
Respondents

...

Writ Petition is filed, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records, relating to the order, dated 06.11.2015, passed by the 2nd respondent Tribunal in O.A.No.448 of 2012 and quash the same, by allowing the Original Application as prayed for and pass further orders.

For Petitioner : Ms.Y.Kavitha

For 1st Respondent : Mr.Syed Mustafa,
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

(Order of this Court was delivered by **S.MANIKUMAR, J.**)

Challenge in this writ petition, is to the order made in O.A.No.448 of 2012, dated 06.11.2015, by which, the Tribunal has refused to quash the order, dated 28.02.2011, passed by the Under Secretary to Government, Union of India, Department of Personnel &

Administrative Reforms, Chief Secretariat, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry, 1st respondent herein, who declined to grant arrears of pay and allowances from the date of notional promotion, to the petitioner to the post of UDC and Assistant respectively.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that she was appointed as Lower Division Clerk (LDC) in Commercial Tax Department on 09.08.1984. The next avenue of promotion is Upper Division Clerk (UDC), which according to the petitioner, is a non-selection post. Vide order, dated 28.12.1998, she was promoted to the post of Upper Division Clerk (UDC). But, inspite of several representations, the said order was not implemented. Her juniors, including one R.Krishnamurthy, was promoted as UDC on 18.12.1998 and as Assistant on 19.05.2006. She was informed that due to the pendency of disciplinary proceedings, she was not promoted. A charge memo, dated 13.07.2004, was issued to her and vide report, dated 28.09.2006, the Inquiry Officer held that the charges, as not proved. She was exonerated from the charges, vide order, dated 14.08.2007. Despite the same, she was not promoted to the post of UDC and Assistant, on par, with her juniors and even, ACP benefits were not granted to her, even though she had submitted representations, dated 28.03.2005 and 23.08.2007 respectively. Therefore, she filed O.A.No.142 of 2008, seeking for a direction to the respondent, to promote her, to the post of UDC and Assistant, from the date, when her juniors were promoted, with all consequential benefits, including arrears of pay and allowances. Vide order, dated 14.10.2009, the Tribunal disposed of the said Original Application No.148 of 2008, with the following directions,

"Since respondent has already exonerated the applicant from all charges there is no reason why the applicant's promotion should not take effect. Accordingly, we direct the respondent to grant the promotion to the applicant from the date from which her immediate junior Shri R.Krishnamurthy was promoted as UDC and grant her all consequential benefits.

The above direction should be implemented within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order."

3. When the abovesaid order was not complied with, by the respondent, the petitioner has filed a contempt petition and thereafter, by order, dated 28.02.2011, petitioner was promoted to the post of UDC, notionally with effect from 04.01.1999 and also to the post of Assistant, on adhoc basis, notionally with effect from 31.05.2006 and on regular basis, with effect from 04.01.2007, on par with her immediate junior Mr.R.Krishnamurthy. Thereafter, the contempt petition was closed on 28.02.2011. But, the respondent, vide Order No.A-48011/12/2003-DPAR/SS.II(2), dated 28.02.2011, communicated that the monetary benefit would be granted, only with effect from the date of actual joining, in the post of Assistant.

Being aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has filed O.A.No.448 of 2012, challenging the order, dated 28.02.2011, passed by the respondent, insofar as the portion, declining to grant arrears of pay and allowances from the date of notional promotion to the post of UDC and Assistant. Consequently, the petitioner has sought for a direction to the respondent to grant arrears of pay and allowances, from the date of notional promotion, in the post of UDC, w.e.f 04.01.1999 and in the post of Assistant, w.e.f 31.05.2006, and all other consequential benefits.

4. Before the Tribunal, the 1st respondent has filed a reply statement and contended that when the petitioner was in service as LDC in Transport Department, during the year 1996, the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Department has conducted a surprise raid, in the Transport Department, in which, it was brought out that 4798 numbers of unremitted demand drafts, amounting to Rs.48,04,312/-, relating to the period from 1994 to 1997, were seized, in that office. The inquiry report revealed that 101 demand drafts, for a total amount of Rs.96,098/-, during the period of service of the petitioner, as LDC, from 28.03.1997 to 30.06.1998, were received and the same were not remitted into Government account, on time. Therefore, the disciplinary authority decided to initiate departmental action against the petitioner and others, for the above misconduct. Based on the advice of the Central Vigilance Commission, a charge memo, was issued to the petitioner on 25.08.2003 and after completion of disciplinary proceedings and as charges were proved, the petitioner was awarded a minor penalty of 'censure' on 04.07.2005.

5. Before the Tribunal, it was the further contention of the 1st respondent that an enquiry was conducted by CBI, into the allegation of criminal conspiracy, on the aspect of misappropriation of Rs.1,58,749/- and Rs.1,18,100/-, received as demand drafts, towards payment of composite tax, fraudulently and stealthily removed from office files, after the issue of certificates, without forwarding to the State Transport Authorities concerned, in favour of whom, those demand drafts were taken. The investigation revealed that the petitioner, while functioning as dealing clerk in the national permit section of the Transport Department, Puducherry, during the period from March' 1997 to July' 1998, had received six demand drafts, towards composite tax permit holder for vehicle No.PY-01-B-3191 all, dated 15.12.1997. Thus, the petitioner was responsible for the above lapses, causing loss to the State Transport Authorities, amounting to Rs.11,000/-. Before the Tribunal, the respondent has submitted that based on the advice from the Central Vigilance Commission, disciplinary proceedings were initiated, against the petitioner and on conclusion of the same, on 14.08.2007, the petitioner was exonerated from the charges, on benefit of doubt.

6. The respondent has further submitted that there was another disciplinary case, contemplated against the petitioner that by

inducing brokers, the petitioner had prepared counter signature permits and issued permits to the vehicle owners, without any recommendation from the competent authority and thereby, violated the procedure and issued counter signature permits to more than forty vehicles. Before the Tribunal, the respondent submitted that the inquiry report of the Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, proved that counter signature permits were issued, in respect of four vehicles bearing Nos.TN-31-3959, TN-04-3859, TN-27-7637, TN-51-3623, without the recommendation of the State Transport Authority of Chennai. According to the respondent, in connivance with the vehicle owners concerned, the petitioner had prepared and issued new counter signature permits for 47 vehicles, without the recommendation letters, from the State Transport Authority, Chennai. By using a forged recommendation letter, one counter signature permit was issued to a vehicle, bearing No.TN-A-9297. The report of the Superintendent of Police was received on 08.07.2003 and that the inquiry officer finally concluded to register a criminal case, against the petitioner and others, under Section 13(1)(a) r/w. 7212 of POC Act, 1988 and Section 468 IPC r/w. 34 IPC and that the same was also approved by the Chief Vigilance Officer. In the abovesaid situation, the original draft charge sheet to be issued to the petitioner and others on 08.04.2004, could not be retrieved, and that there was a delay in initiating the criminal case against the petitioner.

7. It was the further case of the respondent that the name of the petitioner was considered for promotion to the post of UDC, by the Departmental Promotion Committee, held on 09.12.1998, which decided not to consider her promotion, as vigilance clearance was not accorded, and that there was vigilance inquiry, pending against her, at that time. Her name was again considered by the Departmental Promotion Committee, held on 11.08.2003 and that the Committee, on verification of the ACRs., decided her case, as 'Not Yet Fit' for promotion. Lateron, the Committee, in its meeting held on 10.06.2004, considered her case, along with other officials, but the finding of the DPC, in respect of her, was to kept in a sealed cover.

8. Before the Tribunal, the respondent has further submitted that as retrieval of disciplinary proceedings file, from the Law Department was pending, from 08.04.2004, initiation of further disciplinary proceedings, after the lapse of more than eight years, could not be made possible. It is the submission of the respondent that the department has initiated action to implement the orders of the Tribunal in O.A.No.142 of 2008, dated 14.10.2009 and a review Departmental Promotion Committee was conducted on 14.01.2011. The respondent has contended that the said Committee observed that out of three disciplinary cases, in respect of one case, charges have been proved, leading to imposition of minor penalty of 'Censure', vide order, dated 04.07.2005. In another case, the petitioner has been exonerated, only on benefit of doubt and orders were issued on

14.08.2007. In the third case, charge memo has not been issued against her. Therefore, on the above fact situation, the review Departmental Promotion Committee recommended to implement the order of the Tribunal, dated 14.10.2009, for promoting the petitioner, to the post of UDC, on notional basis, with effect from 04.01.1999 and to the post of Assistant, with effect from 31.05.2006, on par with her immediate junior, R.Krishnamurthy, with seniority and other benefits, including monetary benefits, from the date of actual joining in the post of Assistant. The Petitioner has also accepted promotion and joined the post of Assistant on 11.03.2011.

9. Reference has been made to the proceedings in OM No.F.No.22034/4/2012/Estt.(D), dated 02.11.2012 of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi, wherein, it has been clarified, as regards grant of promotion to a Government servant, under cloud, by citing a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India v. K.V.Janakiraman and Others** reported in **AIR 1991 SC 2010**. Reliance has also been placed on the decisions in **A.K.Soumini Vs. State Bank of Travancore & Anr (Civil Appeal Nos.6387-88 of 2003)**, **State of Haryana & Others Vs. O.P.Gupta and Others (Civil Appeal No.2415 of 1996 with No.2416 of 1996)** and in the case of **Union of India Vs. B.M.Jha (Civil Appeal No.5128 of 2001)**, for the principle, "No work no pay". For the reasons, stated supra, reliefs prayed for in O.A.No.448 of 2012, has been opposed.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and decisions relied on, by both the parties, the Central Administrative Tribunal, vide order, dated 06.11.2015, made in O.A.No.448 of 2012, dismissed the application. Assailing the correctness of the order, the instant writ petition has been filed.

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the materials available on record.

11. As per the particulars, furnished by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submissions of Mr.R.Syed Mustafa, learned Special Government Pleader (Pondicherry), the first Departmental Promotion Committee meeting was conducted on 09.12.1998 and at that stage, no disciplinary proceedings, under the conduct rules, was pending against the writ petitioner. It is also the case of the writ petitioner that vide order, dated 28.12.1998, she was promoted to the post of Upper Divisional Clerk, but the said order was not implemented, inspite of several representations. Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, her junior, was promoted as UDC on 18.12.1998.

12. In the 2nd Departmental Promotion Committee, conducted on 11.08.2003, upon verification of petitioner's ACRs, for the period ending 31.03.1999, the Committee has opined that the petitioner is 'Not Yet Fit' for promotion, on the ground that the Reviewing

Officer accepted the assessment report of the Reporting Officer, except in the case of integrity. The disciplinary authority has initiated disciplinary action, against the petitioner and others and based on the advise of the Central Vigilance Commission, a charge memo, dated 25.08.2003, was issued to the petitioner, after completion of the disciplinary proceedings, as the charges were proved, on 04.07.2005, the petitioner was awarded with a minor penalty of 'censure'.

13. The third Departmental Promotion Committee, was conducted on 10.06.2004. Subsequently, the petitioner was issued with another charge memo, dated 13.07.2004. The Inquiry Officer submitted his report, dated 28.09.2006, holding that the charges as not proved. On 14.08.2007, action on the charges has been dropped and that the petitioner has been exonerated from the charges. She preferred O.A.No.142 of 2008, for a direction to the respondent herein, to promote her, to the post of UDC and Assistant, from the date, when her juniors were promoted, with all consequential benefits to the post. After hearing the arguments of both the parties, the Tribunal, vide order, dated 14.10.2009, in O.A.No.142 of 2008, ordered as hereunder:

"Since respondent has already exonerated the applicant from all charges there is no reason why the applicant's promotion should not take effect. Accordingly, we direct the respondent to grant the promotion to the applicant from the date from which her immediate junior Shri R.Krishnamurthy was promoted as UDC and grant her all consequential benefits."

The Tribunal further held that the above direction should be implemented within four weeks from the date of receipt of passing of the order.

14. Material on record further discloses that inasmuch as writ petitioner has sought for a direction to promote her, as Assistant, she sought for corrigendum, in the order made in O.A.No.142 of 2008, dated 14.10.2009. On 04.11.2009, the Tribunal has issued the following corrigendum,

"Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is certain typographical error in the order, dated 14.10.2009 in O.A.No.142 of 2009, in Page 3 and in Para 6 of the aforesaid order the last line of the aforesaid para it has been typed as ".....Shri R.Krishnamurthy was promoted as UDC and grant her all consequential benefits." It should be ".....Shri R.Krishnamurthy was promoted as UDC and Assistant and grant her all consequential benefits." and prays for correction.

The said correction is ordered."

15. Thereafter, the petitioner has made representations, dated 16.06.2010 and 07.12.2010, requesting the 1st respondent to promote her to the post of UDC and Assistant. Departmental Promotion Committee meeting was held on 14.01.2011, the review the case of the petitioner for promotion to the posts of UDC and Assistant from the date of promotion of her juniors as UDC and Assistant, with all consequential benefits. The review Departmental Promotion Committee, has compared the services of both the petitioner and her junior, Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, as hereunder:

Sl.No	Name of the Official <u>Thiru./Tmt.</u>	Date of appointment of LDC with Seniority No.	Date of appointment of UDC with Seniority No.	Date of adhoc appointment of Assistant	Date of regular appointment of Assistant
1	R.Sooriyapreba (Senior)	09.08.1984 (2324)	---	---	---
2	R.Krishnamurthy (Junior)	05.09.1984 (2325)	04.01.1999 (2445)	31.05.2006	04.01.2007

16. After going through the service particulars, the review Departmental Promotion Committee, which held on 14.01.2011, has opined as follows:

"5. In the context of the above factual position and as per the above referred directions of the CAT, Madras, the Committee reviewed the case of the said Tmt.R.Sooriyapreba, LDC. She fulfilled all the conditions of the Recruitment Rules, for promotion to the post of UDC and also finds a place in the zone of consideration for promotion to the post of UDC in the DPC held on 28.12.1998. After going through the service records/ACRs, the Committee recommends her promotion to the post of UDC regularly on notional basis, w.e.f. 04.01.1999, on par with her junior, Thiru.R.Krishnamurthy and to the post of Assistant on adhoc basis notionally w.e.f. 31.05.2006 and w.e.f. 04.01.2007, on regular basis."

17. Thus, it could be seen from the above, vide Memorandum, dated 28.02.2011, notional promotion has been granted to the petitioner, in the post of UDC and on regular basis, with effect from 04.01.1999 and Assistant on adhoc basis, with effect from 31.05.2006 and on regular basis, with effect from 04.01.2007, on par with her immediate junior R.Krishnamurthy. and posted as Assistant in Department of Sainik Welfare, Puducherry, in the existing vacancy, with monetary benefits, with effect from the date of actual joining in the post of Assistant. Accordingly, seniority has been fixed above Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, in both the posts.

18. Vide Office Order, dated 16.03.2011, the Director, Department of Sainik Welfare, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry, has issued orders, to the effect that the petitioner would draw the pay and allowances with monetary benefit, with effect from the date of actual joining in the post of Assistant, ie., in the forenoon of 11.03.2011, in the existing vacancy of Department of Sainik Welfare, Puducherry.

19. Being aggrieved by the denial of arrears of pay and allowances, from the date of notional promotion, as UDC and Assistant, the writ petitioner filed O.A.No.448 of 2012, to set aside the order, dated 28.02.2011, passed by the Under Secretary to Government, Union of India, Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms, Chief Secretariat, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry, 1st respondent herein and consequently, prayed for a direction to the respondent to grant arrears of pay and allowances from the date of notional promotion in the post of UDC, w.e.f. 04.01.1999 and in the post of Assistant, w.e.f. 31.05.2006.

20. Placing reliance on a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India v. K.V.Janakiraman and Others** reported in **AIR 1991 SC 2010**, the 1st respondent has made submissions to justify the postponement of promotion. A contention has also been made that a person cannot be allowed to draw the benefits of a post, the duties of which he had discharged and therefore, denial of pay and allowances in the abovesaid posts, was correct. Reliance has also been made to a decision in **A.K.Soumini Vs. State Bank of Travancore & Anr (Civil Appeal Nos.6387-88 of 2003)**, wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

"The notional promotion given to her by the Bank with suitable revision of her pay scales itself is more than sufficient to meet the requirements, be it either in law or in equity. The further claim for payment of arrears as well is far-fetched and can have no basis in law."

Holding that, "an employee under cloud of doubtful integrity cannot have any rightful claim to be treated on par with her juniors and stake a claim for giving monetary effect to the orders of her promotion.", the Tribunal, vide order, dated 06.11.2015, made in O.A.No.448 of 2012, declined to set aside the order, dated 28.02.2011, passed by the 1st respondent.

21. From the material on record and submissions advanced, it could be deduced that when the petitioner's junior, R.Krishnamurthy, was promoted on 04.01.1999, no formulated charges, against the petitioner. She was found not yet fit for promotion, for the reasons, stated supra. At this juncture, it is relevant to consider, as to whether, dismissal of promotion to the petitioner in 1999, without there being any formulated charges, is justifiable. However,

lateron, notional promotion has been given to the petitioner on 04.01.1999. Had the petitioner been promoted, on par with her junior, on 04.01.1999, she would have discharged the duties attached to the said post.

22. In **Union of India v. K.V. Jankiraman** reported in (1991) 4 SCC 109, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the disciplinary proceedings commence only when a charge sheet is issued. In **UCO Bank v. Rajinder Lal Capoor** reported in (2007) 6 SCC 694, the Hon'ble Apex Court reiterated the same.

23. In **Coal India Limited & Ors. vs. Saroj Kumar Mishra** reported in AIR 2007 SC 1706, the Hon'ble Apex Court, at Paragraph 22, held that a departmental proceeding is ordinarily said to be initiated only when a charge-sheet is issued.

24. In **Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Coal India Limited and Others vs. Ananta Saha and Others** reported in (2011) 5 SCC 142, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"27. There can be no quarrel with the settled legal proposition that the disciplinary proceedings commence only when a charge-sheet is issued to the delinquent employee."

25. In **Union of India v. Anil Kumar Sarkar** reported in 2013 (4) SCC 161, the Hon'ble Apex Court, while considering three questions, viz., (1) What is the date from which it can be said that disciplinary/criminal proceedings are pending against an employee? (2) What is the course to be adopted when the employee is held guilty in such proceedings if the guilt merits punishment other than that of dismissal? and (3) To what benefits an employee who is completely or partially exonerated is entitled to and from which date? and after considering the decision in **Union of India v. K.V. Jankiraman** reported in (1991) 4 SCC 109, held as follows:

"Among the three questions, we are concerned about question No.1. As per the rules applicable, the "sealed cover procedure" is adopted when an employee is due for promotion, increment etc. but disciplinary/criminal proceedings are pending against him at the relevant time and hence, the findings of his entitlement to the benefit are kept in a sealed cover to be opened after the proceedings in question are over. Inasmuch as we are concerned about the first question, the dictum laid down by this Court relating to the said issue is as follows:-

"16. On the first question, viz., as to when for the purposes of the sealed cover procedure the disciplinary/criminal proceedings can be said to have commenced, the Full Bench of the Tribunal has held that it

is only when a charge-memo in a disciplinary proceedings or a charge-sheet in a criminal prosecution is issued to the employee that it can be said that the departmental proceedings/criminal prosecution is initiated against the employee. The sealed cover procedure is to be resorted to only after the charge-memo/charge-sheet is issued. The pendency of preliminary investigation prior to that stage will not be sufficient to enable the authorities to adopt the sealed cover procedure. We are in agreement with the Tribunal on this point. The contention advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant-authorities that when there are serious allegations and it takes time to collect necessary evidence to prepare and issue charge-memo/charge-sheet, it would not be in the interest of the purity of administration to reward the employee with a promotion, increment etc. does not impress us. The acceptance of this contention would result in injustice to the employees in many cases. As has been the experience so far, the preliminary investigations take an inordinately long time and particularly when they are initiated at the instance of the interested persons, they are kept pending deliberately. Many times they never result in the issue of any charge-memo/charge-sheet. If the allegations are serious and the authorities are keen in investigating them, ordinarily it should not take much time to collect the relevant evidence and finalise the charges. What is further, if the charges are that serious, the authorities have the power to suspend the employee under the relevant rules, and the suspension by itself permits a resort to the sealed cover procedure. The authorities thus are not without a remedy.

In para 17, this Court further held:

17. The conclusion No. 1 should be read to mean that the promotion etc. cannot be withheld merely because some disciplinary/criminal proceedings are pending against the employee. To deny the said benefit, they must be at the relevant time pending at the stage when charge-memo/charge-sheet has already been issued to the employee."

After finding so, in the light of the fact that no charge sheet was served on the respondent-employee when the DPC met to consider his promotion, yet the sealed cover procedure was adopted. In such circumstances, this Court held that "the Tribunal has rightly directed the authorities to open the sealed cover and if the respondent was found fit for promotion by the DPC, to give him the promotion from the date of his immediate junior Shri M. Raja Rao was promoted pursuant to the order dated April 30, 1986. The Tribunal has also directed the authorities to grant to the respondent all the consequential benefits. We

see no reason to interfere with this order. The appeal, therefore, stands dismissed." The principles laid down with reference to similar office memorandum are applicable to the case on hand and the contrary argument raised by the appellant-Union of India is liable to be rejected."

26. The petitioner has been issued with a charge memo, dated 25.08.2003 and the disciplinary proceedings, has ended in penalty of censure on 04.07.2005. During the abovesaid period, the 3rd Departmental Promotion Committee was conducted on 10.06.2004 and later, on 13.07.2004, disciplinary action has been initiated and after enquiry, she has been exonerated from the charges, vide order, dated 14.08.2007.

27. During the course of hearing, it was submitted that on 05.06.2008, there are 94 vacancies in the post of Assistant. Had the 1st respondent been considered the case of the petitioner, as against 94 vacancies, in the post of Assistant on 05.06.2008 and appointed the petitioner to the said post, consequently, she would have discharged her duties.

28. In such a view of the matter, the petitioner is entitled to pay and other allowances in the post of Upper Division Clerk from 04.01.1999 till 05.06.2008, the date on which she ought to have been considered for promotion to the post of Assistant. The petitioner is also entitled to fixation of pay, increment and other allowances, attached to the post of Assistant from 05.06.2008, the date on which DPC ought to have considered the case of the petitioner for promotion to the post of Assistant, against the vacancies, after the expiry of punishment of 'Censure', imposed on 04.07.2005 and when further action on the charge memo dated 13.07.2004 has been dropped by the order, dated 14.08.2007.

29. Writ petitioner has retired on 30.04.2014. The respondents are directed to compute the arrears of pay in the post of UDC from 05.01.1999 to 04.06.2008 and taking into account the increments and other allowances that would have been paid in the post of UDC, fix the pay in the post of Assistant from 05.06.2008, compute the arrears of salary, increment and other allowances in the post of Assistant, till her retirement on 30.04.2014.

30. The respondents are further directed to revise the pensionary and other retiral benefits, accordingly. Disbursement of the arrears of salary, increment and other allowances in the above said two posts, has to be done within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

31. In the result, the Writ Petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is also closed.

skm

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Under Secretary to Government,
Union of India, Department of Personnel
& Administrative Reforms, Chief Secretariat,
Government of Puducherry,
Puducherry.

2. The Registrar,
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench, Chennai.

+1 CC M/s.GIRIDHAR & SAI Advocate SR.No.65174

+1 CC The Government Pleader (P) High Court, Madras SR.No.64335

W.P.No.35119 of 2016

MP [CO]

MSI 28/12/2016

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY