

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

Writ Petition(Civil) No.548/2000

INDER PAL YADAV & ORS. ETC. ETC.

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent (s)

( With Appln(s). for stay, exemption from filing yped  
copies of judgment and impleading party and exemption from filing  
dim annexures with Office Report) ( For Final Disposal )

With

SLP(C)No.14048/2001, SLP(C)No.225/2002, SLP(C)No.23341/2002,  
CONMT.PET.(Civil)No.329/2001 iin SLP(C)14048/01, SLP (C)  
No.4159-4160/2001, W.P(C)No.540/2002WP(C) No. 57/2001,  
W.P(C)No.58/2001, W.P(C)No.658/2000, W.P(C)No.659/2000

Date : 13/01/2003 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

hoN'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RUMA PAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. SRIKRISHNA

For Petitioner (s) Mr. B. Dutta, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Anis Suhrawardy, Adv.  
Ms. Shamama Anis, Adv.  
Mr. S. Mehdi Imam, Adv.  
Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Vinay Tripathi, Adv.

Mrs. Poonam Prasad, Av.  
Ms. Jaya Sinha, Adv.  
Mrs. Laxmi Arvind, Adv.

Mr. Kishore Kumar Patel, Adv.

Chandrsa Prakash Paul, Adv.

Mr. Satya Pal Garg, Adv.

Ms. Laxmi Arvind, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, ASG  
Ms. Sunita Inna, Adv.  
Mr. W. Qadri, Adv.  
Mr. Sat Pal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Adv.  
Ms. Priya Hingorani, Adv.

Mrs Anil Katiyar, Adv.

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

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....  
.SP2

SLP(C) No.225/2002@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

The issue which is involved in Writ Petition No.548/2002 is separate from that which is involved in this particular petition and the order of tagging needs to be recalled. The issue involved in the present petition is whether the particular petitioner workman should be considered for promotion on the basis of the rules of the Railway Authorities. This is not an issue which is to be decided in Writ Petition No. 548/2002 in which the basic issue is whether the petitioners in that case are entitled to continue with the ad-hoc promotion in the projects. Hence the matter is detagged. List the matter on Friday, the 17th January, 2003.

Writ Petition No. 540 of 2002@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Writ Petition Nos. 548, 658, 659 of 2000 SLP(C)@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC  
Nos. 4159-4160 and 4048/2001@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Application for impleadment is allowed.

All these Writ petitions and special leave petitions are disposed of in terms of the signed order. There will be no order as to costs.

-3-

Writ Petition Nos. 57, 58/2001, SLP(C)@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC  
No.23341/2002 and Contempt Petition (C) No.329/2001 in@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC  
SLP(C) No.14048/2001@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

These matters are detagged. List these matters on Friday, the 17th January, 2003.

.SP1

Sushma (S. Malkani)  
Court Master

.PA  
.PL55

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Writ Petition NO. 548 OF 2000@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Inder Pal Yadav & Ors. etc. etc. .... Appellant (s)

versus

nion of India & Ors. etc.etc. .... Respondent(s)

With

Writ Petition (Civil) Nos. 658, 659 and SLP(C)  
Nos. 4159-60/2001, 14048/2001.

O R D E R@@  
EEEEEEEEEE

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....  
.SP2

The writ petitioners before us have been appointed as casual employees in different projects of the Northern Railway in the years 1979 to 1981. Because of uncertainty of their tenure, they filed writ petitions before this Court, during the pendency of which, a scheme was framed by the Railway authorities for granting the petitioners temporary status with a view to permanent absorption. This scheme was approved with certain modifications, which are not relevant for the purpose of this petition, by the decision of this Court reported in 1985 (2) SCC 863. The scheme was implemented and the petitioners were categorised as skilled, semi-skilled and un-skilled. The implementation of the scheme was upheld again by this Court when the petitioners filed a complaint in this regard before this court on 11th

-2-

August, 1986. The third petition filed by the petitioners or some of them was disposed of by this Court on 30th October, 1986 in which this Court said that the petitioners before being "absorbed as khalasis on temporary status have to submit themselves to medical examination which is usually taken before a person is conferred temporary status". It was also made clear that the Railway administration would give full benefit of actual service of the petitioner for the purpose of counting their seniority and it would be open to the Railway administration to absorb the petitioners on temporary status either as work khalasis or as gang khalasis in the appropriate scale.

The fourth order in the field is an order dated 2nd December, 1987 on a separate writ petition, in which the petitioners alleged that although the petitioners had served continuously for a long period of time, the Railway administration had neither permitted them seniority nor granted them the same rate of wages as regular employees. This Court by its decision Ram Kumar & Others (reported in 1988 (1) SCC 306) noted that the petitioners had admittedly been in service for more than

-3-

360 days and according to the Railway authorities, they were entitled to temporary status. In the judgment this Court said :

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....J.....

.SP1

"In the Signal and Telecom Construction Organisation under which the petitioners are working, according to the Railway Administration further privileges of being regularised in permanent service is afforded by giving them access to their regularisation against permanent vacancies which mostly occur in open line. For such purpose, casual labour in open line as well as willing project casual labour are combined for the purpose of screening and forming of panel on the basis of seniority depending upon the days of work put in. In view of the submissions, learned counsel for the respondents has pleaded that the allegation of discrimination does not exist".

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....

.SP2

This Court also noted the provisions of the Railway Establishment Manual, which, inter alia deals with the grant of regular status to a temporary appointee after selection through regular Selection Boards for class IV staff. The court accordingly directed that since many of petitioners had been empanelled, the Railway authority was expected to take prompt steps to screen such of the petitioners who were still waiting for the purpose of regularisation of their service.

It is not in dispute that subsequent to the orders of this court, the petitioners were regularised as khalasis in group D in the open line. However, they have been permitted to continue to serve in various projects of the Railway administration. While they were serving in such projects, they have been granted provisional promotion in a particular corresponding scale of pay on the basis of supplementary trade test held in the project itself. However, the order by which such petitioners were granted local provisional or ad hoc promotion made it clear that they would not claim over their seniors in other units. The reason for the filing of these petitions before us by the petitioners is the preparation of lists of surplus staff in the projects. It is the petitioners' case that these surplus lists have been prepared with a view to bring the petitioners back to the open line cadre at the scale of pay applicable to group D employees overlooking that the petitioners had in the meanwhile been promoted to group C and were enjoying much higher scale of pay.

From the documents on record, it is clear that the petitioners have been regularised and continue to

hold the substantive posts of Khalasi in group D category in the open line division of the respondents. Their provisional local promotion in the projects cannot be taken as having vested in them a right either to continue

in the project or to resist reversion back to the cadre, or to enjoy a higher promotion merely on the basis of locally provisional promotion granted to them in the project in which they had been employed at a particular point of time. No rules have been pointed out to us to justify this claim on the part of the petitioners. Besides it this stand of the petitioner were to be accepted it would operate inequitably as far as the regular employees in the open line department are concerned. Furthermore the order of provisional promotion expressly made it clear that the petitioners were in fact provisionally appointed. Therefore, the writ petitioners cannot seek to make such provisional appointment permanent by filing a writ petition to restrain the respondents from reverting them back to their appointed cadre.

However, while the petitioners cannot be granted the reliefs as prayed for in the writ petition, namely, that they should not be reverted to a lower post or that

-6-

they should be treated as having been promoted by reason of their promotion in the projects, nevertheless, we wish to protect the petitioners against some of the anomalies which may arise, if the petitioners are directed to join their parent cadre or other project, in future. It cannot be lost sight of that the petitioners have passed trade tests to achieve the promotional level in a particular project. Therefore, if the petitioners are posted back to the same project they shall be entitled to the same pay as their contemporaries unless the posts held by such contemporary employees at the time of such re-posting of the petitioners is based on selection.

Additionally, while it is open to the Railway administration to utilise the services of the petitioners in the open line, they must, for the purpose of determining efficiency and fitment take into account the trade tests which may have been passed by the petitioners as well as the length of service rendered by the petitioners in the several projects subsequent to their regular appointment.

Where a trade test is provided under the relevant rules for the purpose of promotion to group C, we make it

-7-

clear that it will not be necessary for the petitioners to take the trade tests over-again, if they had already taken any comparable test while they were on duty in the projects. It is stated by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Railway authorities that during the pendency of the writ petitions that several of the petitioners had applied for promotion in the open line from Group B to Group C but only some were successful. It is not necessary to go into this question since we proceed on the basis that there was a requirement of passing a qualifying trade test held for the purpose of promotion from Group D to Group C post held in the projects.

However, we make it clear that so far as further promotions are concerned that is from Group C to Group B, the observations of this Court will not serve to grant

any benefit to the petitioners. It is open to the respondent authorities to proceed in the matter of further promotion in accordance with the rules. We accordingly dispose of these writ petitions and special leave petitions with the aforesaid observations.

-8-

Interim orders are vacated.  
There will be no order as to costs.

.SP1

.....J  
(RUMA PAL)

New Delhi,  
Dated: 13.1.2003

.....J  
(B.N. SRIKRISHNA)