THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

W.P. No.36366 of 2016

ORDER:

Heard Mr.Srinivas Rao holding for Mr.K.Vasudeva Reddy and Mr.J.Sreenivasa Rao for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

On 01.01.2014, the respondent No.3 issued Office Order on Corrigendum Career Growth of Executives of F&A, IED, Legal and Estates disciplines appointed through external and internal source as in CIL. Through the instant Office Order, the 3rd respondent made the Office Order w.e.f 01.03.2013. The 2nd respondent issued Corrigendum No.CRP/PER/C/25/2322 dated 05/8-10-2016, modifying the date as 01.10.2014 instead of 01.03.2013 as stated in Office Order dated 01.10.2014. One of the objections raised by the petitioners against Corrigendum dated 05.10.2016 is that the petitioners were not heard and for all purposes recovery is affected by issuing Corrigendum to the Office Order dated 01.10.2014. The respondents in reply to the above contention have stated thus:

> "It is submitted that a mistake has occurred while issuing the Office Order dated 01.10.2014 which was given to the present petitioners stating that the monetary benefit is from 01.03.2013 which is only for the Management Trainees and not for the existing executives who are not recruited as Management Trainees, but were

> given similar benefit with effect from 01.10.2014 as per the decision taken on 25.03.2014. Accordingly, it was initially approved to issue notice but inadvertently the Corrigendum was issued to correct the mistake that took place on issue of Office Order dated 01.10.2014 to correct the monetary benefit with effect from 01.10.2014. As already pointed out though in principle approval was accorded to issue a prior notice, inadvertently by mistake without following the advice given by the Competent Authority, the impugned Corrigendum dt.05/08.10.2016 was issued which as stated shall be withdrawn and this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to permit these respondents to issue notice to the petitioners without in anyway influenced by the impugned Corrigendum dt.05/08.10.2016."

The statement excerpted above for all purposes admits the omission in straightaway issuing the Corrigendum without putting the petitioners on notice. This Court is relieved of taking up the other contentions urged by the petitioners.

By referring to the short ground, learned counsel consents to dispose of the writ petition.

The Corrigendum dated 05.10.2016 is set aside as without notice and suffers from violation of principles of natural justice. The respondents are given liberty to proceed in accordance with law. In the process, serve individual notices, hear them and pass orders, as are deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

S. V. BHATT, J

Dt: 27.03.2018
dv