

The Institute of Human Resources Development (Ihrd) vs Tojo Sebastian (Demonstrator/Workshop Instructor (Electronics))

The Institute of Human Resources Development (Ihrd) vs Tojo Sebastian (Demonstrator/Workshop Instructor (Electronics))

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1614299

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Mar-29-2021

Judge : Honourable Dr. Justice a.K.Jayasankaran Nambiar,Honourable Mr. Justice Gopinath P.

Appeal No. : WA/424/2021

Appellant : The Institute of Human Resources Development (Ihrd)

Respondent : Tojo Sebastian (Demonstrator/Workshop Instructor (Electronics))

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR & THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P. MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF MARCH 2021 / 8TH CHAITHRA, 1943 WP(C).No.24820 OF 2012(B) PETITIONER:

1 HONEY JOSE, AGED 37 YEARS, W/O.JIJO CHERIAN, TECHINCIAN GR.II, (ELECTRONICS), COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCE (IHRD), THODUPUZHA, RESIDNG AT KOTTAYIL HOUSE, MUTHALAKKODAM

P.O., THODUPUZHA-685 605. IDUKKI DISTRICT. [DELETED] [P1 DELETED FROM THE ARRAY OF PETITIONERS AS PER ORDER DATED 25/01/2018 IN IA.978/2018.] 2 BINDU V., W/O.G.SATHYAJI, TECHINCIAN GR.II(ELECTRONICS), COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, CHENGANNUR.. 3 GEORGE C KAMEL, S/O.K.V.CHERIAN, TECHINCIAN GR.II (ELECTRONICS), COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING,CHERTHALA. 4 TOJO SEBASTIAN, S/O.K.M.DEVASIA, TECHINCIAN GR.II(ELECTRONICS), MODEL POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, MATTAKARA. BY ADVS. SHRI.T.J.MICHAEL SRI.KALEESWARAM RAJ

RESPONDENTS: 1 STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION (B), GOVERNMENT SECRETRIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM. PIN-695 001. 2 THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESORUCES DEVELOPMENT,

PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,PIN-695 014, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR. 3 THE DIRECTOR, THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESORUCES DEVELOPMENT, PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001. 4 THE GOVERNMENT BODY, THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESORUCES DEVELOPMENT, PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001. R1 BY AJ VARGHESE,SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER. R2-4 BY SRI.DEEPU THANKAN, SC, IHRD THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON

29.03.2021, ALONG WITH WA.424/2021, WP(C).4179/2018(V), WP(C).17571/2019(V), THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR & THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P. MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF MARCH 2021 / 8TH CHAITHRA, 1943 WA.No.424 OF 2021 AGAINST THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 24-02-2021 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WP(C) 17571/2019(V) OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA APPELLANTS/RESPONDENTS 1 AND 2: 1 THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT (IHRD) PRAJO'E TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 14, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR. 2 THE DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT(IHRD), PRAJO'E TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 14. BY ADV. SRI.DEEPU THANKAN RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS: 1 TOJO SEBASTIAN (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR (ELECTRONICS), S/O.K.M. DEVASSIA, KALATHIMATTOM, THUMBASSERY, KODATHIPADY, ETTUMANOOR, KOTTAYAM - 686631. 2 BAIJU E.N., (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), S/O. K.NARAYANAN NAIR, EDAKKAT, ATHOLI, KOZHIKODE - 673315. 3 DEEPU JOSEPH, (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS) , C/O. ASHA VARGHESE,

PUTHENPURACKAL HOUSE, PUTHUPPALLY, KOTTAYAM - 686011. 4 SAJITHA V., (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), W/O. JITHESH GANGADHARAN, SUNNY SIDE (H), NAMBIDIPARAMBU, PALAZHI, PALA, G.A. COLLEGE P.O, KOZHIKODE - 673014. 5 AJITHA KUMARI (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS) , C/O. SHAJI E.K, ELLATHUVELI, KARIKKADU P.O, THANNEERMUKKOM S.O, ALAPPUZHA - 688527. R1-5 BY ADV. SRI.E.ADITHYAN R1-5 BY ADV. SMT.MEERA RAMESH R1-5 BY ADV. SRI.J.HARIKRISHNA THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 29.03.2021,

ALONG WITH WP(C).24820/2012(B), WP(C).4179/2018(V), WP(C).17571/2019(V), THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR & THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P. MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF MARCH 2021 / 8TH CHAITHRA, 1943 WP(C).No.4179 OF 2018 PETITIONER: HONEY JOSE, AGED 42 YEARS, W/O.JIJO CHERIYAN, KOTTAYIL HOUSE, MUTHALAKKODAM P.O., THODUPUZHA, (TECHNICIAN GRADE II, ELECTRONICS, COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCES, THODUPUZHA). BY ADV. SHRI.T.J.MICHAEL RESPONDENTS:

1 STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION (B), GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001. 2 THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695014, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR. 3 THE DIRECTOR INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695014. 4 THE GOVERNING BODY, INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD,

THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695014, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN. R1 BY AJ VARGHESE, SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER. R2-4 BY SRI.DEEPU THANKAN, SC, IHRD ADV.UMMUIL FIDA, STANDING COUNSEL. THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 29.03.2021, ALONG WITH WA.424/2021, WP(C).24820/2012(B), WP(C).17571/2019(V), THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR & THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P. MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF MARCH 2021 / 8TH CHAITHRA, 1943 WP(C).No.17571 OF 2019(V) PETITIONERS:

1 TOJO SEBASTIAN, AGED 44 YEARS (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), S/O K M DEVASIA, KALATHIMATTAM, THUMBASSERY, KODATHIPADY, ETTUMANNOOR, KOTTAYAM, KERALA-686631. 2 BAIJU E.N, (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), S/O K NARAYANAN NAIR, EDAKKAT, ATHOLI, KOZHIKODE, KERALA-673 315. 3 DEEPU JOSEPH, (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), C/O ASHAVARGHESE, PUTHENPURACKAL HOUSE, PUTHUPPALLY, KOTTAYAM, KERALA-686 011. 4 SAJITHA V, (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), W/O JITHESH GANGADHARAN, SUNNY SIDE(H), NAMBIDIPARAMBATHU, PALAZHI-PALA, G.A COLLEGE P.O.KOZHIKODE, KERALA,673 014. 5 AJITHA KUMARI P., (DEMONSTRATOR/WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR(ELECTRONICS), C/O SHAJI, E.K, ELLATHUVELI, KARIKKADU P.O.,

THANNEERMUKKOM S.O.ALAPPUZHA, KERALA-688 527. BY ADV. SRI.E.ADITHYAN RESPONDENTS: 1 INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,KERALA, INDIA-695 014. 2 DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT, PRAJOETOWERS, VAZHUTACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, INDIA-695 014. R1-2 BY SRI.DEEPU THANKAN, SC, IHRD THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 29.03.2021, ALONG WITH WA.424/2021, WP(C).24820/2012(B), WP(C).4179/2018(V), THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED

THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT

A.K. Jayasankaran Nambiar, J.

As the writ petitions and writ appeal involve a common issue, they are taken up together and disposed by this common judgment. Writ Appeal No.424/2021 is preferred against the interim order dated 24/02/2021 of the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No.17571/2019. By the said interim order, the learned Single Judge, exasperated with the fact that the appellant- Institute of Human Resource Development (IHRD)- had not filed a counter affidavit in the writ petitions, ordered the personal appearance of the Director of IHRD on 05-03-2021. When the writ appeal against the said interim order came up for admission before us on 04-03-2021, we inquired with the respondents in the writ appeal, who are the petitioners in the writ petitions before the learned Single Judge, as to whether they had any objection in this Court hearing the writ petitions itself in as much as the issue involved in the writ petitions lay in a very narrow compass. When the learned counsel for the writ petitioners as well as the appellant in the writ appeal agreed to the said course of action, we decided to hear the writ petitions and it is accordingly that the matters have come up before us today.

2. The writ petitions were preferred by persons working as

Technicians Grade II (Electronics) in various institutions run by the IHRD. The grievance of the writ petitioners pertains to the non- consideration of their candidature for promotion to the post of lecturer in the said institution. It is their case in the writ petition that in terms of the Special Rules that were in force in the IHRD with effect from 03-11-2001 (Exhibit P1), the promotion to the post of lecturer was to be made of candidates having the required qualification of a degree in Engineering Technology

with 60% marks or a pass in Section A and B of AIME together with three years regular service in the IHRD. It is their case that while they acquired the necessary qualification in terms of the Special Rules of 2001, it was subsequent to 10-05-2011, when an amendment to the Special Rules was contemplated by the IHRD as borne out by Exhibit P2 document. The amended rules also envisaged future appointments to the post of lecturer to be through direct recruitment and not by promotion. The specific case in the writ petitions is that, in as much as the vacancies to the post of lecturer had arisen on various dates prior to 07-02-2011 (the effective date of Exhibit P2), the said vacancies, even if filled thereafter, had to be in accordance with Exhibit P1 Special Rules that governed the field till 07.02.2011. It is therefore their contention that notwithstanding their belated acquisition of the qualifications in Exhibit P1 Special Rules, they could still be considered for promotion. The petitioners in W.P.(C) No.17571/2019, have a

further grievance that while they satisfy the qualification requirements as per the amended Rules, they are denied the benefit of promotion only because in Exhibit P2 amended Rules, the appointment to the post of lecturer is to be through direct recruitment and not through promotion.

3. Through a counter affidavit subsequently filed in the writ

petition, the stand of the IHRD is that it is an autonomous educational institution established by the Government Of Kerala and registered under the Provisions of Literary, Scientific and Charitable Societies Act, 1955. It is stated to have 86 educational institutions all over the state and the control, administration and management of the institute is vested with the governing body of the Society. With specific reference to the Special Rules it is stated that the State Government had vide an order dated 30-07-2008 constituted a committee for framing Rules and for revision of the staff pattern of various institutions under the IHRD. On the basis of the report of the said committee the matter was placed before the IHRD on 07-02-2011 and the governing body resolved to approve the revised

Special Rules and Staff pattern of the IHRD with protection to the existing employees except under AICTE and UGC scheme. A copy of the Government Order dated 30-07-2008 is produced as Exhibit R2(a). It is further stated that the Government constituted a Committee to examine the

anomalies/omissions in the Staff Pattern and Special Rules of IHRD, and based on the report submitted by the said committee, the Government revised the Special Rules of IHRD by a Government Order dated 20-08-2014. It is stated that the Government in the said Government Order have also given due protection to the lecturers appointed on or before 07-02-2011. The stand of the IHRD is essentially that, in as much as the writ petitioners did not have the necessary qualification for promotion to the post of lecturer prior to 07-02-2011, and with effect from the said date the Special Rules itself stood amended, thereby changing the qualifications as also the method of recruitment to the post of lecturer, the petitioners could not claim any right to be considered for promotion to the post of lecturer in accordance with the amended Special Rules.

4. We have heard Sri.Kaleeswaram Raj, the learned counsel

for petitioner Nos.2 to 4 in W.P.(C) No.24820/2012, Sri. T.J.Michael, learned counsel for the 1st petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 24820/2012 and the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.4179/2018, Sri.Adithyan Ezhapilly, learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.(C) No. 17571/2019 and Smt.Ummul Fida, learned Standing Counsel for the IHRD, the respondent in all the above writ petitions and the appellant in W.A. No. 424/2021. We have also heard the learned Government Pleader for the official respondents of the State.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that

the IHRD was not justified in keeping the posts of lecturers unfilled and without promoting the petitioners, since the date of arising of the vacancies in the post of lecturer. It is their further contention that, notwithstanding the fact that they had obtained the qualification contemplated under the erstwhile Special Rules, only after 07-02-2011, the effective date of the amended Rules, their entitlement to promotion had to be determined based on the qualifications obtained by them which were in accordance with the erstwhile Special Rules. In particular, it is contended that unless the IHRD demonstrated that there were valid reasons to keep the vacant posts of lecturers unfilled from the date of arising of the vacancies in the said posts, till the effective date of the revised Rules, they cannot resort to a filling up of the posts of lecturers through direct recruitment, and with persons having the new qualifications prescribed. In support of their contention, they rely on the decision in Dr.K.Ramulu and another v. Dr. S.Suryaprakash Rao and others (1997 (3) SCC 59). As regards the petitioners in W.P.(C) No.17571/2019, it is the submission of the learned counsel Sri Adithyan Ezhapilly, that the petitioners had the necessary qualification even under the revised Rules and hence the IHRD was not justified in relying on the amendment to the method of recruitment to deny them

appointment to the post of lecturer.

6. On a consideration of facts and circumstances of the case

and the submissions made across the bar, we are of the view that in as much as it is the admitted case that as on the effective date of the revised Special Rules namely 07-02-2011, the writ petitioners did not have the necessary qualification even as per the un- amended Special Rules of 2001, their contention that there was no conscious decision taken by the IHRD to keep the vacant posts of lecturers unfilled, cannot come to their aid since even if the IHRD had decided to fill the said vacancies, the petitioners could not have been promoted. Their right for

consideration for promotion would, in that event, have been postponed to the date on which they acquired the necessary qualification under the un-amended special rules. In the instant case, by the time the petitioners obtained the qualifications as per the erstwhile Special Rules, sanction had already been accorded for implementation of the amended Special Rules. For the period after 07-02-2011 therefore, the IHRD could not be faulted for not filling up the vacancies in the post of lecturer based on the erstwhile Special Rules, for it is settled law that an employer can choose to fill up vacant posts in accordance with amended rules, even if they are in a draft stage. It is also well settled that candidates do not have a vested right for promotion and an amendment in a Rule resulting in the candidate

in a feeder category being rendered ineligible for promotion cannot be seen as affecting the right of the said candidate. It is the Rule that is prevalent at the time when the consideration for promotion takes place that would be applicable on the facts and circumstances of the case. (See: Deepak Agarwal and another v. State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2011 (6) SCC 725). That apart, while it may be true that a conscious decision has to be taken by an employer in choosing not to fill up a vacant post by promotion, there is no absolute Rule that vacancies must be filled in accordance with the Rule existing as on the date of occurrence of the vacancy, unless the Rule in question lays down any particular time frame within which the selection process is to be completed (See: State of Tripura and another v. Nikhil Ranjan Chakraborty and others (2017 (3) SCC 646 and Union of India and others v. Krishnakumar and others (2019 (4) SCC 319).

In the instant cases, as already noticed, the petitioners cannot find fault with the IHRD for not effecting promotions to the post of lecturer till 07-02-2011, since they were admittedly not qualified for such promotion even as per the un-amended Special Rules. Their subsequent acquisition of qualification as per the un-amended Special Rules also

could not come to their aid since by that time the amended Special Rules had come into force,

notwithstanding that they received the formal approval of the Government only in 2014 (Exhibit P13 in W.P.(C) No.4179/2018). Thus, in any view of the matter, the petitioners cannot aspire for a promotion to the post of lecturer in the various institutions of IHRD. The writ petitions therefore fail and are dismissed. As a

consequence W.A.No.424/2021, preferred against the interim order

dated 24-02-2021 in W.P.(C).No.17571/2019, is allowed. Sd/- A.K. JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR JUDGE Sd/- GOPINATH P. JUDGE SSK/30/03 APPENDIX OF WP(C) 24820/2012 PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS: EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEARING NO.E4/7750/2001/HRD DATED 03-11-2001 ISSUED BY THE IHRD. EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS NO.EA2/1685/2008/IHRD DATED 10-05-2011 ISSUED BY THE IHRD. RESPONDENT'S/S EXHIBITS:NIL APPENDIX OF WP(C) 4179/2018 PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS: EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF APPOINTMENT ORDER BEARING NO.E4/1802/2000/HRD DATED 01.11.2000. EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE DIPLOMA IN ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING. EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF HALL TICKET OF THE PETITIONER FOR THE EXAMINATION OF AMIE. EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF PASS CERTIFICATE OF PART A & B OF AMIE DATED 20.11.2011. EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 3.11.2001 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.3. EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF PROCEEDING DATED 3.09.2002 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.3. EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 10.05.2011 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.3. EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF IHRD SPECIAL RULES PRESCRIBING THE QUALIFICATION FOR VARIOUS POSTS IN IHRD.

EXHIBIT P9

TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION

ANNEXURES). EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) NO.21799/2011 WHICH IS DATED 22.8.2011. EXHIBIT P11 TRUE COPY OF LETTER ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER DATED 25.1.12. EXHIBIT P12 TRUE COPY OF THE W.P.(C) NO.24820/12 WITHOUT EXHIBITS. EXHIBIT P13 TRUE COPY OF GOVERNMENT ORDER DATED 20.08.2014 BEARING NUMBER GO (MS) NO.692/14/H.EDN. PRESCRIBING STAFF PATTERN AND QUALIFICATION FOR SELECTION FOR VARIOUS POSTS.

EXHIBIT P14 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT WHICH IS DATED 23/08/2016. RESPONDENT'S/S EXHIBITS: EXHIBIT R2(A) TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER VIDE GO(RT)NO 1135/2008/H.EDN DATED 30.7.2008 APPENDIX OF WP(C) 17571/2019 PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS: EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE DOCUMENT SHOWING APPOINTMENT DATES OF PETITIONERS 1 TO 5. EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE POST OF LECTURER IN ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING DATED 28.8.2018. EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY AWARDDING B TECH DEGREE TO THE PETITIONERS. EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS FORWARDED BY THE PETITIONERS. EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY OF THE SECOND RESPONDENT TO REPRESENTATIONS DATED 12TH JULY 2012. EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PORTION OF THE

INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL RULES 2014 WITH REGARD TO APPOINTMENT TO THE POST OF LECTURER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING/TECHNOLOGY. EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY RECEIVED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPRESENTATION FORWARDED BY THE PETITIONERS DATED 17.12.2018 EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WP NO 2316 OF 2019 DATED 25TH DAY OF JANUARY 2019 EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT DATED 5TH MARCH 2019 TO THE

POST OF LECTURER IN THE BRANCH OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
EXHIBIT P11 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE SECOND RESPONDENT
DATED 9TH MAY 2019 EXHIBIT P12 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED BY
THE FIRST AND SECOND RESPONDENTS DATED 22-01-2021
RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: SSK/09/02 //TRUE COPY// P.A. TO JUDGE

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com