

(1997) 01 SC CK 0158

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Slp (C) No. 25086 Of 1996

U.P. Secretariat U.D.A. Association through its Joint
Secretary, G.C. Srivastava and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of U.P. and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 27-01-1997

Acts Referred:

Citation : (1997) 6 SCALE 5 : (1997) 4 SCALE 15 : (1997) 3 SCALE 24 : (1997) 10 SCC 537

Hon'ble Judges : K. Ramaswamy, J;G. T. Nanavati, J

Bench : Division Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

K.RAMASWAMY, J.-This special leave petition has been filed against the order of the division bench of the Allahabad High court, made on 2/7/1996 in Writ Petition No. 6200 of 1993. When the direct recruits had filed the special leave petition, this court by order dated 20/11/1996 dismissed the same. Shri Gopal Subramaniam, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, who are now promotee UDCs in the U.P. Secretariat Services contends that the learned Judges have given their reasoning at pp.58 and 59 thus:

"FROM the aforesaid decisions of the Hon"ble Supreme court, it is evident that the initial appointment of the promotees on officiating basis was not in accordance with the Rules, 1942, rather it was de hors the Rules. The contention of the petitioner that the quota as envisaged in Rule 21 of the Rules, 1942, has broken down or collapsed simply for the reason that due to certain administrative difficulties neither the selection for direct recruits nor the selection by promotion against the vacancies took place in the selection years with effect from 1971 to 1978, and hence according to the decision of the Hon"ble Supreme court in O.P. Singla v. Union of India and Direct Recruit Class II Officers" case the petitioners (promotees) should not be pushed down before the appointees from the other sources inducted into the service on later date (proposition E of the Direct

Recruit Class II case) appears to be misconceived. Petitioners were not at all prejudiced because of non- selection during the aforesaid period for the reasons that the direct recruitment also did not take place during the aforesaid period and that the petitioners in accordance with the seniority on the post of LDA were given officiating promotion on the post of UDA against the vacancies existing in their quota or otherwise. In view of the aforesaid position, it cannot be said that the quota rule, as envisaged, under Rule 21 of Rules 1942 has collapsed down."

2. The above reasoning is not correct for the reason that during the relevant period neither direct recruitment nor promotions were made in accordance with the Rules. As a consequence, since the promotees have been continuously officiating on the posts they are entitled to be put back to the date from which they have been continuously officiating on the ground that the rule of quota has broken down. We find no force in the contention. From the judgment of the Constitution bench of this court in Direct Recruit Class II Engineering Officers "Association v. State of Maharashtra it is now settled law that merely because temporary appointment or promotion came to be made, seniority cannot be counted from the date of officiation except when the appointment was made in accordance with rules. Though appointment is temporary, if it was made in accordance with rules and to a substantive vacancy, seniority will be counted from the date of temporary promotion. Necessarily, the quota and rota require to be maintained so as to give effect to the object envisaged under the Rules. Mere inaction cannot be made the ground to contend that the quota rule was broken down. It is not in dispute that appointments have been made in officiating capacity against the vacancies reserved for direct recruitment though no recruitment had taken place. They are not according to the Rules and within the quota. The division bench, therefore, has rightly held that the direct recruit is to be treated from the date on which he actually joined the service, though vacancies did exist prior to that. As a consequence, the promotees are also required to be fitted into the service from the date when they are entitled to fitment in accordance with quota and rota prescribed under the Rules. The division bench, therefore, has rightly declined to grant the relief to the petitioners.

3. The special leave petition is accordingly dismissed.