

bJ  
ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.2

SECTION XIV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 2872 OF 2010

UNION OF INDIA

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

A.K.GOEL & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP, impleadment and prayer for interim relief and office report )

WITH

C.A.No. 2873/2010

(With Appl.(s) for permission to file SLP and with office report)

S.L.P.(C) Nos. 22952-22953/2010

(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P.(C) No. 23393/2010

(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P.(C) No. 12481/2006

(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P.(C) No. 29515/2010

(With Appl.(s) for directions and with Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

C.A. No. 2492/2011

(With Prayer for Interim Relief)

S.L.P.(C) No. 17098/2011

(With Appl.(s) for bringing on record)

S.L.P. (C) No. 17099/2011

(With Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 23102/2011

(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 24662/2011

(With Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) Nos. 31202-31203/2011

(With Appl.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and c/delay in refiling SLP and with office report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 32839/2011

(With Appl.(s) for recalling the court's order and with Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

C.A. Nos. 295-296/2012

(With Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) Nos. 3599-3600/2012

(With Appl.(s) for directions and exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment and addition/deletion of parties and with office report)

S.L.P. (C) Nos. 3604-3605/2012  
(With Appl.(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the  
impugned Judgment and deletion of the name of  
respondent and modification of Court's Order and with  
office report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 22910/2012  
(With Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 26437/2012  
(With Appl.(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the  
impugned Judgment and with office report)

S.L.P. (C) No. 35330/2012  
(With Appl.(s) for PERMISSION TO APPEAR AND ARGUE IN  
PERSON and permission to place addl. documents on  
record and c/delay in filing SLP and with office report)

S.L.P. (C) No.2720/2012  
(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) Nos. 3469-3472/2012  
(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) Nos. 15725-15726/2012  
(With Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

S.L.P. (C) No.25091/2013  
(With Appl.(s) for c/delay in filing process fee and with  
office report)

S.L.P. (C) No.22319/2013  
(With Office Report)

Date: 20/11/2013 These matters were called on or hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.M. LODHA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KURIAN JOSEPH

For Appellant(s) Ms. Indira Jaising, A.S.G.

Ms. V. Mohana, Adv.  
Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Anindita Pujari, Adv.  
Ms. Sonakshi Malhan, Adv.  
Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Adv.  
Mr. Rajiv Dalal, Adv.

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Kaushik, Adv.

Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Shakil Ahmed Syed, Adv.

Mr. B.V. Balaram Das, Adv.

Ms. Nisha Bagini, Adv.  
Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, Adv.  
Ms. Pooja Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Vikas Mehta, Adv.

Mrs Anil Katiyar, Adv.

Mr. V. Shekhar, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. S. Ganesh, Adv.  
Ms. Ashly Cherian, Adv.  
Ms. S. Rama, Adv.  
Mr. Piyush Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Vishal Saxena, Adv.  
Mr. M.A.Chinnasamy, Adv.

Mr. Shreekant N. Terdal, Adv.

Mr. V. Giri, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Parijat Sinha, Adv.  
Ms. Reshmi Rea Sinha, Adv.  
Mr. Anil Kr. Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. S.C. Ghosh, Adv.

Petitioner-In-Person

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Aftab Ali Khan ,Adv.  
Mr. Shakil Ahmed Syed ,Adv.  
Dr. V.P. Appan ,Adv.  
Mr. Devender Jha, Adv.  
Mr. Bijan Kumar Ghosh, Adv.  
Ms. Sarla Chandra, Adv.  
Mr. P.N. Puri, Adv.  
Mr. Raj Singh Rana, Adv.  
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Anirudh Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, Adv.  
Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.  
Mr. Sureshan P., Adv.  
Mr. Shiva Pujan Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Gaurav Kejriwal, Adv.  
Mr. Balraj Dewan, Adv.

Respondent-In-Person

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

This is a group of 24 matters - 4 Civil Appeals and 20 Special Leave Petitions.

2. These matters have been posted before a Bench of three Judges in light of the order dated 29.03.2010 which reads as follows :-

"Leave granted.

In view of the apparent conflict between the decisions of this Court in Dev Dutt vs. Union of India & Ors. 2008 (8) SCC 725 on the one hand and Satya Narain Shukla vs. Union of India 2006 (9) SCC 69 and K.M. Mishra vs. Central Bank of India and others

2008 (9) SCC 120, these appeals are referred to a Larger Bench. Let the matter be placed before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for this purpose."

3. The above reference is wholly and squarely answered by a three Judge Bench in Civil Appeal No. 5892 of 2006 - Sukhdev Singh Vs. Union of India and Others - decided on 23.04.2013 reported in (2013) 9 SCC 566. The three Judge Bench in Sukhdev Singh (supra) ruled as follows :-

"8. In our opinion, the view taken in Dev Dutt that every entry in ACR of a public servant must be communicated to him/her within a reasonable period is legally sound and helps in achieving threefold objectives. First, the communication of every entry in the ACR to a public servant helps him/her to work harder and achieve more that helps him in improving his work and give better results. Second and equally important, on being made aware of the entry in the ACR, the public servant may feel dissatisfied with the same. Communication of the entry enables him/her to make representation for upgradation of the remarks entered in the ACR. Third, communication of every entry in the ACR brings transparency in recording the remarks relating to a public servant and the system becomes more conforming to the principles of natural justice. We, accordingly, hold that every entry in ACR - poor, fair, average, good or very good - must be communicated to him/her within a reasonable period.

9. The decisions of this Court in Satya Narain Shukla vs. Union of India and others, (2006) 9 SCC 69, and K.M. Mishra vs. Central Bank of India and others, (2008) 9 SCC 120, and the other decisions of this Court taking a contrary view are declared to be not laying down a good law."

4. Ms. Indira Jaising, learned Additional Solicitor General, submits that in Dev Dutt Vs. Union of India & Ors., 2008 (8) SCC 725, the cut-off date for the applicability of the judgment has not been decided. She submits that this aspect needs to be decided by a larger Bench.

5. We do not think so. The only point on which reference is made stands answered by the judgment in Sukhdev Singh (supra). In this view, there is no necessity of any further consideration by the larger Bench.

6. The matters shall now be posted before the concerned Bench.

7. The contention about cut-off date raised on behalf of the Union of India may be raised before the concerned Bench. The private petitioners/appellants may also raise any other point which in their view needs to be considered by the Bench.

|(Rajesh Dham)  
|Court Master

|(Renu Diwan)  
|Court Master

|