
(1997) 04 SC CK 0118

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Civil Appeal No. 1239 of 1987

J.P.S. Saroha and Another

APPELLANT

Vs

Union of India (UOI) and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-04-1997

Acts Referred:

Citation : (1997) 5 JT 121 : (1997) 3 SCALE 744 : (1997) 6 SCC 93 : (1997) SCC(L&S) 1257 : (1997) 3 SCR 831

Hon'ble Judges : K. Ramaswamy, J;D. P. Wadhwa, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : K.B. Sounder Rajan and T.L. Garg, for the Appellant; P.P. Malhotra, Senior Advocate, Y.P. Mahajan and C.V.S. Rao, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. This appeal by special leave arises from the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi made on May 30, 1986 in O.A. No. 173/1986.

2. The admitted position is that appellant No. 1 was appointed as a Junior Scientific Assistant, Grade-II on 30.10.1967. He was made permanent on April 1, 1970 and was further promoted as a Senior Scientific Assistant on 1.10.1973 in Defence Research and Development Organisation. Similarly the second appellant was appointed as Junior Scientific Assistant, Grade 1 on 6.6.1967 and was made permanent on April 1, 1970. He was promoted as Junior Scientific Assistant, Grade I on 25.3.1971. They held all the posts while they were continuing in Defence Research & Development Organisation (DRDO). Subsequently, in 1976, the Technical Committee (Engineer Stores) was constituted and it was transferred so as to be under the charge of Director General of Inspection. They were transferred within that Department and continued to be in the said Department. With effect from January 30, 1979, the Department was further trifurcated as DRDO, Director General of Inspection and Technical Committee (Engineers Stores). It would appear that the chances of promotions accelerated

in DRDO. The appellants, therefore claimed repatriation to the DRDO from Director General of Inspection. Since the respondents' requests were not acceded to, they filed O.A. in the Tribunal. The Tribunal dismissed the O.A. Thus, this appeal by special leave.

3. It is contended for the appellants that by fortuitous circumstances, they have been posted in the Director General of Inspection and in the Technical Committee (Engineers Stores). Since common seniority was maintained prior to the trifurcation, they had no grievance for their continuance under the control of Director General of Inspection. At the time of trifurcation, though the Department called for option from Grade-I but to grade-II Officers, no such option was given. The appellants said that this was against their wishes. They cannot be made to suffer the continuance in a transferee Department and, therefore, they are entitled to all the benefits of promotions. When a person junior to them in DRDO was confirmed and promoted to a higher post, the appellants claimed parity. Having regard to the contentions, the question that arises for consideration is: whether the non-transfer of the appellants to the DRDO is vitiated by any manifest error warranting interference? It is seen that initially DRDO and DGI were two separate operations. In respect of the service in Technical Committee, personnel were discharging the respective duties assigned to them and the personnel therein were transferred to the administrative control of the Director General of Inspection. The entire wing having been transferred, to be in the control of the Director General of Inspection, necessary consequence would be that the personnel working there would remain in the Department. It is not the case of the transfer of the employees from one Department to other Departments on option basis. Under these circumstances, though the persons have been appointed subsequent to them while they remained within the charge of DRDO Department, they cannot claim that injustice has been done to them. Under these circumstances, we think that there is no illegality in the order passed by the Tribunal warranting interference.

4. The appeal is accordingly dismissed. If there are any rights given to them and the personnel similarly situated have been given accelerated promotions that would be a different cause of action. The appellants would be free to avail of remedy as is available under the law.