
(1998) 08 SC CK 0011

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : C.A.Nos. 3946-49 of 1998 (Arising out of SLP (C) No's. 9380-9383 of 1996) (with C.A. No's. 3950-3953 of 1998) (Arising out of SLP (C) No's. 1113-1116 of 1996)

Union of India

APPELLANT

Vs

Tara Chand Sharma and Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-08-1998

Acts Referred:

Citation : AIR 1998 SC 3383 : (1998) AIRSCW 3329 : (1998) 5 JT 415 : (1998) 4 SCALE 519 : (1998) 6 SCC 345 : (1998) SCC(L&S) 1498 : (1998) 3 SCR 1179 : (1998) 6 Supreme 337

Hon'ble Judges : Sujata V. Manohar, J;G.B. Pattanaik, J

Bench : Division Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Pattanaik, J.—Leave granted in all the Special Leave Petitions.

2. The inter se seniority between respondents Nos. 1 to 4 who had been promoted to the post of Computers on regular basis on 20.8.90 and 10.10.90 and the ad hoc appointees to the said posts respondent Nos. 5 to 37 herein whose services were regularised on 14.3.1991 is the subject matter for consideration in these appeals. It transpires from the available materials on record that certain posts having been created for 1981 Census in the cadre of Computers respondents Nos. 5 to 37 were appointed against those posts but even after the Census operation was over those posts continued and respondents Nos. 5 to 37 were also continued. Ultimately the Registrar General of India after due consultation with the Department of Personnel and Training regularised those appointees by letter dated 12th March, 1991, and it was also indicated that the past services rendered by them before regularisation would also count for their seniority as well as eligibility for promotion to the higher grade. Respondents Nos. 1 to 4, on the other hand, had been promoted as Computers on regular basis between the period 20th August, 1990 to 10th October, 1990. When the

seniority list was drawn up on 12th April, 1993 respondents Nos. 5 to 37 having been placed above respondents Nos. 1 to 4 a representation was made by the said respondents Nos. 1 to 4. The representation having been rejected they approached the Central Administrative Tribunal at Jaipur by filing OA Nos. 93, 121, 122 and 172 of 1994. The Tribunal by the impugned judgment being of the view that the ad hoc appointees are not entitled to get their services as ad hoc for the purpose of counting the seniority since the appointment itself was dehors the rules allowed these OAs and held that respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to be senior to respondents Nos. 5 to 37 in the cadre of Computer. It may be noticed at this stage that the promotion of respondents Nos. 1 to 4 to the post of Computer was not on a substantive basis and after expiry of the sanction of the posts of Computer created for 1991 census on account of non availability of posts of Computer in the cadre, respondents Nos. 1 to 4 were reverted. The said order of reversion was assailed before the Central Administrative Tribunal and the Tribunal had annulled the order of reversion. But the aforesaid order of the Tribunal being assailed in this Court by the Union of India in C.A. Nos. 9572-75 of 1995 by judgment dated 19th October, 1995 this Court came to hold that the fact of abolition of posts having been established and the respondents Nos. 1 to 4 herein having been temporarily promoted to those posts, which have been abolished, they cannot raise any objection for the consequential reversal order. The order of the Tribunal was accordingly set aside and the appeal of the Union of India was allowed thereby. The order of reversion of respondents Nos. 1 to 4 herein from the posts of Computer to their substantive post was approved by this Court. Though opportunity has been given to said respondents Nos. 1 to 4 to indicate whether they are still continuing as Computer but no such assertion has been made. Though Mr. Krishnamani, learned senior counsel appearing for respondents Nos. 1 to 4 contended that that would be a matter which would ultimately be decided only when the seniority matter is finalised we are unable to accept this contention since we find that the respondents Nos. 1 to 4 are no longer continuing as Computers, their order of reversion having been upheld by this Court, as already referred to, and therefore, the question of determining their inter se seniority with respondent Nos. 5 to 37 in the cadre of Computer would not arise.

3. In the aforesaid premises, it is not necessary for us to examine the larger question as to whether the order of Registrar General directing that the services of respondents Nos. 5 to 37 even prior to regularisation can be counted for the purpose of their seniority in the cadre. On the admitted position, therefore, while the respondents Nos. 5 to 37 are still continuing as Computer their services having been regularised by the order of Registrar General in consultation with the Department of Personnel respondents Nos. 1 to 4 have been reverted from the said cadre and necessarily therefore, respondents Nos. 5 to 37 would be held to be senior in the cadre of Computers. The impugned judgment of the Tribunal in the aforesaid OAs is set aside and the appeals of the Union of India are allowed and the OAs stand dismissed.

4. The appeals arising out of SLP (c) Nos. 1113-1116 of 1996 for the reasons already indicated are also allowed. But in the circumstances there will be no order as to costs.