
(1995) 01 SC CK 0078
In the Supreme Court Of India
Case No : Civil Appeal No. 922 of 1995

T. Shantharam

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Karnataka and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 16-01-1995

Acts Referred:

Citation : AIR 1995 SC 1123 : (1995) 70 FLR 1063 : (1995) 2 JT 642 : (1995) LabIC 613 : (1995) 1 SCALE 320 : (1995) 2 SCC 538 : (1995) 1 SCR 274 : (1995) 1 UJ 611

Hon'ble Judges : S. C. Sen, J;K. Ramaswamy, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : K. Madhava Reddy, G.K. Narasimha, K.V. Vijayakumar and Girish Ananthamurthy, for the Appellant; Ram Jois, S.N. Bhat, M. Veerappa and K.H. Nobin Singh, for the Respondent

Final Decision : allowed

Judgement

1. Leave granted.

2. The facts are telling that the appellant was appointed in the Revenue Department as Second Division Clerk in Mangalore on October 8, 1963. He was sent on deputation to the Food and Civil Supplies Department which was then part of Revenue Department as Assistant Civil Supplies Inspector on December 26, 1967 and was promoted as Second Grade Civil Supplies Inspector on September 11, 1968 which is stated to be equivalent to Sheristedar. The 5th respondent Mr. R.K. Vasudev was appointed as a Second Division Clerk on January 22, 1965 in Food Wing of the Revenue Department. Thereafter he was regularised as second Division Clerk on September 30, 1971 and was promoted as a Sheristedar on June 17, 1982. From these facts, it is clear that at all levels of appointments and promotions, the appellant was always senior to 5th respondent. But one fact that remain on record is that the appellant continued to be on deputation in the Food Wing of Revenue Department. When he was sought to be repatriated, the appellant filed Application No. 6432/86 before the

Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore. The Tribunal by its order dated January 28, 1988 directed absorption of the appellant in the Food Department as indicated in the order which reads thus : -

Since the applicant is working in the Food and Civil Supplies Department since 1966 (about 32 years and he has not been given any proforma promotion in the Revenue Department and there are no valid ground to reject his request for absorption, we are of the considered opinion that the Applicant is entitled for a direction to the respondents to absorb him in the Department of Food and Civil Supplies in the post now held by him. It is ordered accordingly after quashing Annexure A.

Subsequent thereto it would appear that the appellant was absorbed and he was placed above the 5th respondent and also promoted on January 1, 1980 as a Assistant Director. It would also appear from the record that the 5th respondent also promoted as Assistant Director. The only question is of inter se seniority between the appellant and the 5th respondent. Shri Rama Jois, learned senior counsel for the respondent contended that the Rules prescribed that on the deputation the post should be the post equivalent to which he was holding in the parent department and the appellant cannot be transferred and deputed in the Food Wing on higher post than the post hold in the parent department. Though there is force in the contention as per the Rules but meat of the matter is that the appellant uninterruptedly worked in the Food department till date of the order by the Tribunal. Under these circumstances, though initially he might have mistakenly been deputed to hold higher post in the Food and Civil Supplies Department, since the appellant had obviously discharged his duties and higher responsibilities to the satisfaction of all concerned, at this distance of time, it is highly unjust to send him back to hold the post in the present department which he was entitled to hold and the Tribunal is not right to interfere with action of the department in its absorption of the appellant as per its own earlier order. The direction given by the Tribunal at the instance of 5th respondent in the impugned order dated July 10, 1994 is accordingly set aside and the order issued in the earlier proceedings stands confirmed. In consequence the order of absorption and the promotion given to the appellant stand upheld. The appeal is allowed. No costs.