



2024:DHC:5271



\$~73

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 11th July, 2024

+

W.P.(C) 8177/2018

KAVINDER SINGH VOHRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan, Ms. Mahima
Anand and Ms. Hema Sukhija, Advocates.

versus

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Pramod Gupta, Ms. Nicole
Gomez, Ms. Adyanshi Kashyap and Mr. Harsh
Jaiswal, Advocates for Respondent No. 1.
Mr. Anil Soni, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH****JUDGMENT****JYOTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. This writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following reliefs:

“A. Issue writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari thereby calling forth to this Hon'ble Court all the records pertaining to the issue involved in the present Writ Petition especially the records pertaining to the selection and appointment to the post of Security Assistant (Technical) Grade-II in the Lok Sabha Secretariat made in pursuance of the Advt. No. 02/2016;

B. After perusal of the records so called forth, set aside the impugned Memorandum dated 17.08.2017 (Annexure P/1);

C. Issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent No. 1 to appoint the Petitioners to the post of Security Assistant (Technical) Grade-II in the Lok Sabha Secretariat;

D. Issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent No. 1 to appoint the Petitioner from the date on which any of persons amongst those declared successful on 03.02.2017, was actually appointed to the post of Security Assistant (Technical) Grade-II;



2024:DHC:5271



D. Issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent No. 1 to fix the seniority of the Petitioner on the basis of his performance in the personal interview held for the post of Security Assistant (Technical) Grade-II in the Secretariat;

E. Issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the Respondent No. 1 to grant the Petitioner all the other service benefits, which would have been available to him by virtue of his holding the post in the grade of Security Assistant (Technical) Grade-II in the Secretariat,

F. Award the cost of the proceedings in favour of the Petitioners and against the Respondents;

G. Any other or further order(s) that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case may kindly be also passed in favour of the Petitioners and against the Respondents."

2. Case of the Petitioner as set out in the writ petition is that Petitioner is an Ex-serviceman, who after serving the Indian Army for more than 17 years, retired as Subedar on 31.07.2013. In consonance with the policy of the Government of India to re-employ Ex-servicemen, Respondent No.2/Cabinet Secretariat issued an advertisement for filling up the post of Deputy Research Officer ('DRO') on re-employment basis and Petitioner applied for appointment to the said post. Being successful in the selection process, Petitioner was offered appointment vide Memorandum dated 14.11.2014. According to the Petitioner, his appointment was a temporary appointment against a temporary post as mentioned in the offer of appointment. Petitioner accepted the offer of appointment as he was in need of a job and joined Respondent No.2 on 17.12.2014. However, owing to unavoidable circumstances, Petitioner tendered his resignation on 31.05.2015 after serving for 5½ months, which was accepted and Petitioner was relieved.

3. Petitioner avers that later he came across an Advertisement bearing No.02/2016, published by Parliament of India (Joint Recruitment Cell), in



2024:DHC:5271



the month of August, 2016, whereby applications were invited from eligible Ex-servicemen for filling up 64 vacancies in the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical) in Respondent No.1/Lok Sabha Secretariat (hereinafter referred to as the 'LSS'). There was no stipulation in the advertisement that Ex-servicemen, who had served any Organisation on re-employment basis on temporary basis, shall be ineligible for appointment. Being eligible in all respects and technically suitable for the job, Petitioner applied for the said post in the prescribed Form mentioning therein that he had worked with Respondent No.2 from 17.12.2014 to 31.05.2015 and that the post was not a regular post.

4. Petitioner states that after due scrutiny of the application form and being satisfied that Petitioner was eligible on all parameters, LSS called him for personal interview in December, 2016. Parliament of India (JRC) vide notice dated 03.02.2017 posted the result of the recruitment process on its website declaring that 65 persons were successful for appointment, which included the Petitioner. In fact, Petitioner had secured 65.8% marks in the personal interview, which were way above the minimum cut-off percentage in his category. Hoping and expecting to get a call letter from LSS asking him to join the post, Petitioner was surprised to receive a Memorandum dated 29.05.2017 instead, whereby Petitioner was called upon to clarify the status of his re-employment in the Aviation Research Centre ('ARC'), Cabinet Secretariat so as to claim benefit of his status as Ex-servicemen for the present recruitment.

5. It is averred that in order to satisfy the query of LSS, Petitioner approached Respondent No.2 to issue a certificate indicating the nature of his appointment to the post of DRO (IA) in the Directorate General of



2024:DHC:5271



Security. In response thereto, for the first time, Respondent No.2 through its Office Memorandum dated 12.06.2017 intimated that Petitioner was appointed against a permanent post of DRO (IA) w.e.f. 17.12.2014 on re-employment basis. This information was factually incorrect and contrary to the terms of appointment letter, which stipulated that the appointment was temporary and against a temporary post. Thereafter, Respondent No.1 cancelled the candidature of the Petitioner for appointment to the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical) vide Memorandum dated 17.08.2017, on the ground that he was appointed in the ARC on regular basis and thus would be deemed to have availed the benefit of his status as Ex-servicemen in terms of DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 read with O.Ms. dated 02.04.1992 and 10.10.1994, which provide and clarify that once an Ex-serviceman joins the Government job on civil side after availing benefit given to him as an Ex-serviceman for his re-employment, his Ex-serviceman status for the purpose of re-employment in Government ceases. It is this Memorandum, which is the subject matter of challenge before this Court in the present petition.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner assails the impugned Memorandum dated 17.08.2017, whereby the candidature of the Petitioner has been cancelled and argues that the entire case of the LSS is predicated on DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985, whereas DoPT O.Ms. do not *per se* apply to LSS unless adopted in terms of Rule 9 of the Lok Sabha Secretariat (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 1955 ('1955 Rules') read with Rule 22 thereof. In the present case, nothing has been placed on record by LSS to evidence that DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 was adopted by LSS and therefore, the very foundation of the case of LSS falls to the ground.



2024:DHC:5271



7. It is next urged that the primordial reason to invoke the said O.M. and cancel the candidature of the Petitioner was that the nature of appointment of the Petitioner with Respondent No.2 was regular, which is incorrect on a factual score. Petitioner was never employed with Respondent No.2 as a regular employee against a regular post and this is evident from a plain reading of offer of appointment/Memorandum dated 14.11.2014, wherein it is mentioned in the first paragraph itself that the appointment was on a temporary post of DRO (IA). In Paragraph 2, it is stipulated that the appointment was on a temporary basis and until further orders. It is thus not open to Respondent No.2 at this belated stage to urge contrary to the terms of employment mentioned in the appointment letter, by simply filing an affidavit before this Court and stating therein that this was an inadvertent typographical error. No steps were taken by Respondent No.2 at any stage to correct the appointment letter, either during the service of the Petitioner with Respondent No.2 or any time thereafter and it is only when the present petition was filed that Respondent No.2 has taken this erroneous stand, possibly at the behest of LSS. Since the appointment of the Petitioner was clearly on temporary basis, his employment cannot be considered as regular and thus the case of the Petitioner is covered by O.M. dated 07.11.1989 dealing with extension of second time benefit to Ex-servicemen for reservation in Groups 'C' and 'D' posts/services, which *inter alia* provides that provisions contained in O.M. dated 02.05.1985 shall not apply to those Ex-servicemen, who have been re-employed or are re-employed by Private Companies/Autonomous Bodies/Public Sector Undertakings and Government Offices on casual/contract/temporary on *ad hoc* basis and who can be removed from such services at any time by the employer concerned.



2024:DHC:5271



8. Elaborating further on this argument, Mr. Chauhan strenuously submits that O.M. dated 07.11.1989 makes it amply clear that any Ex-serviceman, who is first appointed to a civil post against a temporary post or on temporary/*ad hoc* basis and who could be removed from such service at any time by his employer, would be entitled to get the benefit of re-employment to a civil post second time. Respondent No.2, while appointing the Petitioner, had categorically mentioned in Memorandum dated 14.11.2014 that the appointment of the Petitioner was temporary and his services could be terminated at any time by the Department on one month's notice and therefore, the impugned order cancelling the candidature is in ignorance of the status of the appointment of the Petitioner with Respondent No.2 as well as the O.M. dated 07.11.1989 and cannot be sustained in law. Last but not the least, learned counsel emphasises that Petitioner has not only rendered dedicated and unblemished service to the Nation but is a meritorious candidate having scored 65.8% in the personal interview and deserves to be appointed to the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical) in LSS.

9. Mr. Anil Soni, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.2, relying on the counter affidavit, more particularly paragraph 12 thereof, submits that appointment of the Petitioner to the post of DRO (IA) in the Department of Respondent No.2 was made in terms of the Recruitment Rules ('RRs') notified on 17.02.2011. As per the said RR, there existed 110 permanent posts of DROs (IA) in ARC, for which mode of induction was 75% by direct recruitment and 25% by deputation or absorption or re-employment, failing which, by direct recruitment. As per the vacancy statement for the year 2013-14, copy of which has been annexed



2024:DHC:5271



with the affidavit, as on 01.06.2013, there were 12 vacancies under the deputation or re-employment quota. With regard to these vacancies, a Circular dated 27.08.2013 was issued in terms of the RRs for recruitment of DROs (IA) on re-employment basis and perusal of the RRs and vacancy statement shows that post of DRO (IA), against which Petitioner was appointed, was a permanent post and not a temporary post, as alleged by him. The expression “temporary post” was erroneously mentioned in the Memorandum dated 14.11.2014 and that this was an error, is evident from a holistic reading of the said document, wherein it was mentioned that Petitioner would be placed on probation for a period of two years. It is urged that probation and subsequent confirmation on satisfactory completion of probation period is a concept unknown to a temporary appointment and had the Petitioner not resigned and completed his probation satisfactorily, he would have been confirmed on the post, his appointment being on regular basis. The stand of the Petitioner is thus fallacious and importantly, whether or not a post is regular in a Department, is a matter of record and nature of the post cannot change due to an inadvertent typographical error in a letter.

10. Mr. Pramod Gupta, learned counsel for LSS, taking the Court through the chronology of dates and events, submits that pursuant to the advertisement inviting applications from eligible Ex-servicemen for the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical) in LSS, Petitioner applied and was called for personal interview vide Call Letter dated 17.11.2016 and interviews were held from 07.12.2016 to 20.12.2016. Results were declared on 03.02.2017, whereby 65 candidates were declared successful for appointment, including the Petitioner. In the result notice, reference was made to the contents of the Call Letters issued to the candidates wherein it



2024:DHC:5271



was stated that the candidature was provisional and candidature/appointment may be cancelled/terminated at any time, in case any declaration/information furnished by the candidate did not match with the requirements advertised for the post. Petitioner was placed at serial No.12 in the panel but before issuing the offer letter, when the documents were scrutinised as per procedure, it was observed that after discharge from the Indian Army on 31.07.2013, Petitioner was re-employed for 5½ months in ARC of Respondent No.2 as DRO (IA) and his candidature was cancelled in terms of DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985, which provides that once an Ex-serviceman joins the Government job on civil side after availing benefits given to him as an Ex-serviceman for re-employment, his Ex-servicemen status for the purpose of re-employment in Government ceases. In fact, DoPT O.M. dated 07.11.1989 clarifies that provisions of O.M. dated 02.05.1985 shall not apply to those Ex-servicemen who have been or are re-employed by Private Companies/Autonomous Bodies/Public Sector Undertakings and Government Offices on casual/contract/temporary/*ad hoc* basis and who can be removed from such services at any time by the employer concerned.

11. It is argued that Petitioner had in his application form stated that his appointment with Respondent No.2 was not on a regular basis and therefore, his application was initially accepted, but on a doubt arising on the status of his employment, a communication was sent to Respondent No.2 inquiring about the nature of his appointment. In response, Respondent No.2 vide letter dated 10.04.2017 categorically stated that Petitioner was appointed to the post of DRO (IA) on re-employment basis in PB-II with Grade Pay Rs.4200/- w.e.f. 17.12.2014 on regular basis *albeit* he resigned on 31.05.2015. In view of this stand, Petitioner having availed the benefit of his



2024:DHC:5271



Ex-servicemen status once for re-employment with the Government, cannot be permitted to avail the benefit second time. It is wrong for the Petitioner to contend that he was appointed on a temporary basis at a temporary post as the position stands amply clarified by the affidavit of Respondent No.2 that he was appointed against a regular vacancy. Moreover, the terms of appointment incorporated in Memorandum dated 14.11.2014 also show that Petitioner was appointed on probation for a period of 2 years subject to confirmation on satisfactory service, which cannot be a term of appointment of a person appointed on temporary basis against a temporary post. Had the Petitioner continued for two years and rendered satisfactory service, he would have been confirmed on the post, but he chose to tender his resignation in less than 6 months.

12. In response to the contention raised by the Petitioner that DoPT O.Ms. are inapplicable to the recruitment in question as the same were never adopted by LSS, it is argued by Mr. Gupta that in exercise of powers conferred under Article 98(3) of the Constitution of India, the 1955 Rules were framed and promulgated w.e.f. 01.10.1955 by the President of India, in consultation with the Speaker, Lok Sabha. These Rules have been in force and the powers conferred by these Rules are exercised by the Speaker through various executive orders issued from time to time including for regulation of recruitments, appointments, promotions etc. within the Secretariat. As per Rule 22 of 1955 Rules, the Speaker, may from time to time, by general or special orders, provide for convenient and efficient transaction of business arising out of administration of these Rules and procedure to be followed for the purpose. Accordingly, by order dated 17.12.2004, Speaker delegated the powers to administer matters connected



2024:DHC:5271



with Rule 9 of 1955 Rules to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha. The executive orders followed by the Government of India such as the DoPT O.Ms. are examined and submitted for consideration and approval of Secretary General and upon approval, are made applicable to employees of LSS. DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 regarding re-employment of Ex-servicemen has been approved and applied to various recruitments including the present one and there can be no grievance on this score.

13. It is further contended that it is not open to the Petitioner to argue that O.M. dated 02.05.1985 is inapplicable because it was not adopted by LSS, as by that parameter, his very application pursuant to advertisement will be a nullity since Petitioner has sought re-employment by virtue of Ex-servicemen (Re-employment in Central Civil Services and Posts) Rules, 1979, as amended from time to time, which too were never specifically adopted by LSS.

14. Heard learned counsels for the parties and examined their rival contentions.

15. Indisputably, Petitioner applied for the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical) in LSS pursuant to an Advertisement No.02/16. The applications were invited from eligible Ex-servicemen and after successfully clearing the personal interview, Petitioner was placed at No.12 in the panel of 65 candidates declared successful for appointment. Petitioner had admittedly stated in the application form that his appointment with Respondent No.2 was not on regular basis and therefore, his application was not rejected at the initial stage. However, after the Petitioner was empanelled and the scrutiny of documents was underway, considering that Petitioner had been re-employed with Respondent No.2 between 17.12.2014 to 31.05.2015,



2024:DHC:5271



Respondent No.1 wrote to Respondent No.2 seeking clarification with respect to the nature of his appointment i.e. whether the appointment was on casual/contract/temporary on *ad hoc* basis or regular basis and relevant documents were also sought in this context.

16. Respondent No.2 responded to the letter dated 29.03.2017 and in its reply dated 10.04.2017 stated that Petitioner was appointed to the post of DRO (IA) on re-employment basis in PB-II with Grade Pay Rs.4200/- w.e.f. 17.12.2014 on regular basis *albeit* he resigned on 31.05.2015. After examining the response from Respondent No.2, matter was examined in the LSS and applying the provisions of DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 read with O.Ms. dated 02.04.1992 and 10.10.1994, candidature of the Petitioner was cancelled vide impugned Memorandum dated 17.08.2017. Petitioner does not contest that as per O.M. dated 02.05.1985, once an Ex-serviceman joins the Government job on the civil side after availing benefits given to him as an Ex-serviceman for his re-employment, his Ex-servicemen status for the purpose of re-employment with Government ceases. On his joining the civil employment, he is deemed to be a civil employee and will accordingly be entitled to only such of the benefits like relaxation of age etc. DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 is extracted herein for ready reference:-

“No.36034/27/84-Estt.(SCT)
Government of India/Bharat Sarkar
Ministry of Personnel & Training, Administrative
Reforms and Public Grievances and Pension
(Department of Personnel & Training/Karmik
Aur Parikshan Vibhag)

New Delhi, the 2.5.1985.

*Subject: Reservation for ex-servicemen in Group 'C'
And 'D' posts/services- Clarification
Regarding second time benefit.*

.39016/7/78-
Estt (C),

*The undersigned is directed to refer to
this Department's marginally noted Office*



2024:DHC:5271



*Dt. 10/19/5.78.
.39016/15/79-
Esst. (C).,
Dt. 7.9.81.
.39016/10/79-
Esst. (C), dt.
15.12.79.*

Memoranda And Notification regarding reservation for ex-servicemen in Group 'C' and Group 'D' posts/services, and to say that reference have been received in this Ministry seeking Clarification on the point whether an ex-serviceman would continue to get the benefits as provided in the various order and instructions issued from time to time even after having secured employment in the civil services after his release or discharge from the Armed Forces. In the other words, whether an ex-servicemen can apply again for any vacancy reserved for ex-servicemen in the central government service and claim all the benefits admissible to ex-servicemen even if he is holding a civil post after his release/discharge/ as the case maybe.

2. The matter has been carefully considered and it has now been decided that once that an ex-serviceman has joined the Government job on the civil side after availing of the benefits given to him as an ex-serviceman for his re-employment, his ex-serviceman status for the purpose of re-employment with government ceases. On his joining the civil employment, he is deemed to be a civil employee and will accordingly be entitled to only such of the benefits like relaxation of age etc. As admissible to civil employees in the normal course in accordance with the existing instructions in this regard, subject to his fulfillment the conditions governing the grant of such benefits.

3. Ministry of Finance etc., are required to bring the contents of this Office Memorandum to the notice of all the attached and subordinate offices under their control.

*Sd/-
(BATA K. DEY)
DIRECTOR (JCA)''*

17. Petitioner lays a siege to the impugned action on two-fold grounds. It is firstly urged that the DoPT O.Ms. are not *per se* applicable to LSS unless adopted and so far O.M. dated 02.05.1985 has not been adopted by LSS and



2024:DHC:5271



cannot govern the recruitment in question. Secondly and without prejudice, it is urged that Petitioner was appointed with Respondent No.2 on a temporary basis against a temporary post and cannot be deprived from taking benefit of his Ex-servicemen status while applying with LSS for appointment to the post of Security Assistant Grade-II (Technical). In this context, Petitioner seeks the benefit of O.M. dated 07.11.1989, which carves out temporary employment from the rigours of O.M. dated 02.05.1985.

18. Insofar as the applicability of DoPT O.Ms. is concerned, it is stated on an affidavit filed on behalf of LSS that in exercise of powers conferred under Article 98(3) of the Constitution of India, the 1955 Rules were framed and promulgated w.e.f. 01.10.1955 by the President of India, in consultation with the Speaker, Lok Sabha. These Rules have been in force and the powers conferred by these Rules are exercised by the Speaker through various executive orders issued from time to time including for regulation of recruitments, appointments, promotions etc. within the Secretariat. As per Rule 22 of 1955 Rules, the Speaker, may from time to time, by general or special orders, provide for convenient and efficient transaction of business arising out of administration of these Rules and procedure to be followed for the purpose. Accordingly, by order dated 17.12.2004, Speaker delegated the powers to administer matters connected with Rule 9 of 1955 Rules to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha. The executive orders followed by the Government of India such as the DoPT O.Ms. are examined and submitted for consideration and approval of Secretary General and upon approval, are made applicable to employees of LSS. DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985 regarding re-employment of Ex-servicemen has been approved and applied to various recruitments including the present one. In view of this stand of



LSS, it is not open for the Petitioner to contest the applicability of DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985. For ready reference, Rules 9, 22 and 23 of 1955 Rules are extracted hereunder:-

“9. Other conditions of service. – *In respect of all other matters regulating the conditions of service of officers for which no provision or insufficient provision has been made in these rules, officers shall be governed by such rules as are applicable to the officers of the corresponding rank in the Central Secretariat, subject to such modifications, variations or exceptions, if any, in such rules, as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Ministry of Finance, by order, from time to time specify.*

Explanation. – *For the purposes of this rule, the Speaker may, after consultation with the Ministry of Finance, by order, specify the posts in the Central Secretariat which shall correspond to the posts in the Secretariat.*

xxx

xxx

xxx

22. Transaction of business – *The Speaker may, from time to time, by general or special order, provide for the convenient and efficient transaction of business arising out of the administration of these rules and the procedure to, be followed for the purpose.*

Provided that such order may also specify the matter or class of matters which shall be brought to the personal notice of the Speaker before any orders are issued.

23. Residuary powers – *Subject to the provisions of Rule 9, all matters not specifically provided for in these rules, whether incidental or ancillary to the provisions of these rules or otherwise, shall be regulated in accordance with such orders as the Speaker may, from time to time, make.”*

19. This contention of the Petitioner is fallacious for yet another reason. A bare reading of the writ petition, more particularly, paragraphs 29 and 30 show a contra stand of the Petitioner, wherein he avers that scheme of re-employment of Ex-servicemen is regulated by DoPT through Office Memorandums, issued on the subject from time to time and that O.M. dated 02.05.1985 lays down that the second time benefit of Ex-servicemen would not be admissible to those Ex-servicemen, who have availed of the benefit of Ex-servicemen during their first re-employment in civilian post. It is further



2024:DHC:5271



averred that DoPT O.M. dated 07.11.1989 carves out an exception with regard to applicability of O.M. dated 02.05.1985 by providing that the latter O.M. will not apply to those who are not employed at the first instance on re-employment on regular basis. Therefore, by his own understanding DoPT O.Ms. are applicable to LSS and govern the present recruitment. Petitioner, however, wants this Court to selectively apply O.M. dated 07.11.1989, which suits his case and hold that O.M. dated 02.05.1985 is inapplicable as its provisions work against his interest. Petitioner cannot be permitted to approbate and reprobate. In view of the categorical stand of LSS on affidavit that by exercising powers under Rules 9 and 22 of 1955 Rules, the Speaker had delegated the powers to issue and adopt orders and guidelines governing recruitments and terms and conditions of employees to the Secretary General, who in turn adopted the DoPT O.Ms. and that O.M. dated 02.05.1985 has been applied across to recruitments concerning Ex-servicemen, the contention that the said O.M. will be inapplicable to the present recruitment is hereby rejected.

20. Coming to the only other plank of argument of the Petitioner that he was not appointed on a regular basis with Respondent No.2 and is thus outside the rigours of DoPT O.M. dated 02.05.1985, in my view, the same cannot be accepted. Respondent No.2 has filed an affidavit categorically stating that appointment of the Petitioner was on regular basis and he was placed on probation for 2 years. On satisfactory completion of 2 years' probation, Petitioner may have been confirmed. Both the Respondents are right in arguing that the expression "temporary" was only a typographical error as the post was regular and Petitioner was placed on probation to be confirmed later, which is a condition alien to an appointment against a



2024:DHC:5271



temporary post. Moreover, Respondent No.2 has also detailed and established in the affidavit that the post in question against which Petitioner was appointed was a regular post. It is stated that as per RRs, 110 permanent posts of DRO (IA) existed in ARC for which mode of induction was 75% by direct recruitment and 25% by deputation or absorption or re-employment, failing which by direct recruitment. As per the vacancy statement for the year 2013-14, as on 01.06.2013 there were 12 vacancies under deputation/re-employment quota. From the vacancy statement annexed with the affidavit, it is clear that the post in question was a regular post and the appointment of the Petitioner was thus on a regular basis. Having thus availed the benefit of the status of Ex-servicemen once at the time of re-employment with Respondent No.2, Petitioner cannot be granted the benefit for the second time by virtue of the provisions of DoPT O.Ms. dated 02.05.1985 and 07.11.1989.

21. Accordingly, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned Memorandum and the writ petition is dismissed being devoid of merit.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JULY 11, 2024/DU/KA