

ç1

SLP(C)No. 20366 OF 2000

ITEM No.2

Court No. 5

SECTION XIA  
A/N MATTER

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.20366/2000  
(From the judgement and order dated 22/03/2000 in OP 20226/99  
of The HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

SUNU VARGHESE & ORS.

Respondent (s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)  
( With Appln(s). for for c/delay in refiling SLP )  
( For Final Disposal )  
With

SLP(C)No.13684-13685/2001,SLP(C)No.20146-20152/2000,SLP(C)No.7049/2000

Date : 07/03/2002 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAJENDRA BABU  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.G. BALAKRISHNAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. VENKATARAMA REDDI

For Petitioner (s) Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, ASG.  
Mr. Kailash Vasdev, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Amita Verma, Adv.  
Mr. P. Parmeswaran, Adv.  
Mr. B. Krishna Prasad,Adv.  
  
Mr. Roy Abraham, Adv.  
Mr. Himinder Lal, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. R. Sathish,Adv.  
  
Mr. Vinod M.P.,Adv.  
  
Mr. M.K. Michael,Adv.  
  
Mr. Sudarsh Menon,Adv.  
Ms. Anne Mathew, Adv.  
Mr. K.N. Madhusoodhanan, Adv.  
  
Mr. K.R. Sasiprabhu, Adv.  
  
Mr. K.M.K. Nair, Adv.

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

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

SLP(C) Nos.20366 and 7049 of 2000@@  
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Heard learned counsel for the parties from 12.05 p.m.  
to 12.45 p.m.

...2/-



the writ petition and quashed the selection of the degree holders. It is in these circumstances, these matters are before us. The relevant rules have been produced along with an affidavit before us and there is no difference in the rules pertaining to the Junior Engineer (Civil) or Junior Engineer (Electrical) in the matter of prescription of the qualification. They have to possess the three year diploma or its equivalent in the respective branch in which they are seeking appointment. This is clearly set out in the notification. What was produced before the Court being only a draft and that was what had been looked into the whole error crept in the judgment. Hence, we set aside the order of the High Court and dismiss the writ petitions filed by the respondent by setting aside the order and allow these appeals.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, it would be appropriate that the Union of India should compensate each of the respondents by paying costs in a sum of Rs.2,500/- to each of the respondents.

.SP1

.....J.  
( S. RAJENDRA BABU )

.....J.  
( K.G. BALAKRISHNAN )

.....J.  
( P. VENKATARAMA REDDI )

New Delhi,  
March 7, 2002.