

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SCivil Appeal No(s). 5360/2009

THE STATE OF TRIPURA &amp; ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

SAHID ALI &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 29-08-2017 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADARSH KUMAR GOEL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UDAY UMESH LALITFor Appellant(s) Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR  
Mr. Rituraj Biswas, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. Devansh A. Mohta, Adv.  
Mr. Amit Yadav, Adv.  
MR. Nilakanta Nayak, Adv.  
Mr. Shishir Deshpande, AOR  
  
Ms. Sujata Kurdukar, AORUPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E RThe appeal is allowed in terms of the signed  
order.Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand  
disposed of.(MADHU BALA)  
COURT MASTER (SH)  
(Signed order is placed on the file)(PARVEEN KUMARI PASRICHA)  
BRANCH OFFICER

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.5360 Of 2009

THE STATE OF TRIPURA & ORS.

...APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

SAHID ALI & ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The respondents were selected in pursuance of an advertisement dated 18.09.2001 for appointment as constables in Tripura Police. Subsequently, it was decided to reduce the number of persons to be appointed as a result of which the respondents were not allowed to join. Their appointment letters were cancelled on the ground that the same had been issued inadvertently. The High Court directed appointment of the respondents as constables. Hence this appeal.

We find it difficult to hold that the decision of the State Government to reduce the in-take of candidates was mala fide. Having regard to the entirety of facts and circumstances, the decision of the appellants ought not to have been set aside.

Accordingly, we set aside the impugned order and allow this appeal.

.....J.  
[ADARSH KUMAR GOEL]

NEW DELHI  
29TH AUGUST, 2017

.....J.  
[UDAY UMESH LALIT]