Sh Jitendra Singh,  
  
Secretary General, IRPOF  
  
  
  
            During discussions with Sh. Y.S. Chaudhary, I gathered a  
very important information about Sh. K.J. Reddy and Sh T.Venkatswarlu  
of Traffic department who had filed a case for anti dating of their  
induction from the date of vacancy instead of the finalization of the  
DPC (as is presently done) under OA NO. 128/2002 and OA No. 133/2001  
respectively in the CAT at Hyderabad. Sh. K.J. Reddy was inducted in  
Gp. ‘A’ w.e.f. 15/7/99 against the vacancy of 1996. He therefore  
claimed that his induction should be antedated w.e.f. 1996.  
  
  
  
In the words of the judgement:  
  
  
  
            “As per the applicants … abnormal delay in holding the DPC  
for 1996 has caused irreparable loss and injury to the applicants …………  
The applicant having been considered against the vacancies of 1996,  
being within the zone of consideration by virtue of completing 8 years  
of Gp. ‘B’ regular service as against 3 years provided in the code.  
Appointing the applicant with effect from 15.07.99 instead of 1996  
vide the impugned order dated 12.8.1999 was highly arbitrary and  
illegal.  
  
  
  
When direct recruits have been appointed against 60% direct  
recruitment quota vacancies of 1996, delaying by 3 years the  
appointment of the applicant against the 40% promotees quota of  
vacancies of 1996 was highly arbitrary, discriminatory and against all  
principles of natural justice. The delay in conducting the DPC was  
entirely on the part of the respondents and for the lapse of  
respondents; the applicant could not be put on loss.  
  
  
  
The Hon’ble Court; then held as under:  
  
  
  
“17. the respondents, are, therefore, directed to carry out correction  
in the seniority of promotion of the applicants to the Group ‘A’ posts  
in which they have been officiating from the date when regular vacancy  
arose and from the date of promotion of the applicants against such  
regular vacancy, which as per the claim of the applicants arose in  
1996.  
  
  
  
I am surprised, that such a good judgement given by the Hon’ble Court  
as for back as 2005, has not been brought to the notice of all. The  
facts must have been known to our Federation, as a very important  
office bearer of our Federation and the Secretary of SC Rly happens to  
be law officer of SC Rly. In fact the Federation should have taken up  
this issue with the administration. At least, this aspect should have  
been told to Sh. Y.S. Chaudhary while filing almost similar case in  
the Principal bench of CAT at New Delhi.  
  
  
  
Should we, at least, now, expect a positive act on behalf of the  
Federation, if not earlier.  
  
  
  
Hope to hear soon from you.  
  
PARAMJIT KUMAR  
CHIEF STATION MANAGER  
NEW DELHI