

(1996) 07 SC CK 0056

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Civil Appeal No. 9521 of 1996.

Dr. Surinder Singh Jamwal and another	APPELLANT
Vs	
State of Jammu and Kashmir and others	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-07-1996

Acts Referred:

Citation : AIR 1996 SC 2775 : (1996) 74 FLR 2080 : (1996) 6 JT 725 : (1996) LabIC 2444 : (1996) 2 LLJ 795 : (1996) 5 SCALE 528 : (1996) 9 SCC 619 : (1996) 3 SCR 663 Supp : (1996) 4 UPLBEC 2755

Hon'ble Judges : K. Ramaswamy, J;G. B. Pattanaik, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : D.D. Thakur and L.R. Singh, for the Appellant; Ranjit Kumar, Anu Mohla and Ashok Mathur, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

K. Ramaswamy, J.—Leave granted, we have heard counsel on both sides.

2. The controversy raised in this case is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court reported in J and K. Public Service Commission, etc. Vs. Dr. Narinder Mohan and others etc. etc., It is not in dispute that the appellants were recruited on ad hoc basis and have been continuing as such. It is their contention that since they had put in more than 13 years of service they are entitled to regularisation of service and approached the High Court for direction to regularise their services. The High Court has followed the ratio in the above judgment and dismissed the petition. In the light of the judgment of this Court the settled legal position now is that the recruitment to the service should be governed by the appropriate statutory rules. Under the rules the regular recruitment to the posts shall be made by the Public Service Commission. Consequentially, the ad hoc appointments would be only temporary appointments de hors the rules, pending regular recruitment without conferring any right to regularisation of service. This Court in Narinder Mohan's case (supra) had given the following directions:

Accordingly, we set aside the directions issued by the Division Bench of the High Court and confirm those of the Single Judge and direct that State Government of the J & K to notify the vacancies to the PSC which would process and complete the selection, as early as possible, within a period of six months from the date of the receipt of this order. The State Government should on receipt of the recommendation, make appointments in the order mentioned in the selection list within a period of two months thereafter. Since the respondents have been continuing as ad hoc doctors, they shall continue till the regularly selected candidates are appointed. They are also entitled to apply for selection. In case any of the respondents are barred by age, the State Government is directed to consider the cases for necessary relaxation under Rule 9(3) of the age qualification. If any of the respondents are not selected, the ad hoc appointment shall stand terminated with the appointment of the selected candidate. The direction sought for by Dr. Vinay Rampal cannot be given. His appeal is accordingly dismissed and the State appeal is also dismissed. The appeals of the PSC are accordingly allowed but in the circumstances parties are directed to bear their own costs.

3. Following the above directions, there shall be a direction to the State Government to notify the vacancies to the Public Service Commission within a period of two months from today. On notification so made, it would be open to the appellants to apply for regular recruitment. It would be for the PSC to consider the respective claims of the candidates who have applied for and to make necessary selection according to rules. On selection so made and recommendation made to the State Government, the State Government will make appointments as per rules within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of the list of the selected candidates from the PSC. The PSC is directed to complete the process of the selection within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the requisition. The State Government after receipt of the lists shall make the necessary appointments in accordance with law. Till then the appellants would continue only on ad hoc basis till the regularly selected candidates are appointed.

4. It is obvious that the appellants have become barred by age for the direct recruitment. It would, therefore, be necessary that the State Government would relax the necessary age qualification so as to enable them to apply for and seek recruitment through PSC.

5. The contesting respondents who have come on record have stated that the panel stands expired during the interregnum due to the order of suspension granted by this Court. Under these circumstances, the life of the panel is extended for the period during which the stay order is in operation.

6. The appeal is accordingly disposed of. No costs.