

M. P. Junior Engineer's Association and Sangarsh Samiti and Others

Vs

State of Madhya Pradesh and Another

Civil Appeal No. 1191 of 1990

(S. Ranganathan, V. Ramaswami-II JJ)

16.02.1990

JUDGMENT

RANGANATHAN, J. –

1. The controversy in this special leave petition arises out of the merger, with effect from October 1, 1982, of the staff of the Madhya Pradesh Lift Irrigation Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'the Corporation') with that of the Irrigation Departments of the State Government consequent on the abolition of the Corporation. We have heard counsel on both sides and we are of opinion that these matters should be disposed of finally even at this stage. We therefore grant leave in the special leave petition and proceed to dispose of the appeal.

2. Appellant 2 to 17 and certain other writ petitioners in the High Court were serving as Senior technical Assistants (STAs) in the Corporation. The cadres of STAs and the lower cadre of Junior Technical Assistant (JTAs) in the Corporation were equivalent respectively to the cadres of Junior Engineer (JE) and Sub-Engineers (SE) in the Irrigation Department of the State. It is common ground that the qualifications for appointment to the two sets of posts were the same and that their pay sealed were also the same. The appellants claim that they are entitled, after the merger of the Corporation into the Irrigation Department, to be treated as Junior Engineers and considered for promotion as Assistant Engineers on completion of two years of service but that this avenue of promotion is being denied to them by the State.

3. To appreciate the above contention it is necessary to set out some historical background of the cadres in the State Department. Initially the Junior Engineer's post in the State Government was a non-gazetted post, governed by the Madhya Pradesh Irrigation Department (Non-Gazetted) Service Recruitment Rules, 1969. The Junior Engineers, on completion of two years' minimum service, were entitled to consideration for promotion to the gazetted post of Assistant Engineer, is post governed by the Madhya Pradesh Irrigation Engineering Service (Gazetted) Recruitment Rules, 1968. On March, 17, 1973 the posts of Junior Engineers were declared to be gazetted posts. 75 per cent of the posts of Assistant Engineers could be filled up by promotion from amongst Junior Engineers. On January 1, 1978 the Junior Engineer's post was once again converted into a non-gazetted posts. The quota for such those Junior Engineers as were working as gazetted officers immediately before the issue for this order was retained at 75 per cent as before for a period of two years by which time it was expected that all of them would get promoted as Assistant Engineers. But for this, the posts of Assistant Engineers were to be filled up equally by promotion from subordinate cadres in the following proportion :

Junior Engineers (Non-Gazetted) - 25 per cent

Overseers (Sub-Engineers) - 20 per cent

Head Draftsman/Draftsman - 5 per cent

4. In July 1979 the government decided to abolish the post of Junior Engineers in the state Irrigation Department. The relevant cabinet order set out the following terms therefor.

1. The posts of Junior Engineer in the three works departments should be abolished. The Junior Engineer presently working in these departments shall continue to work in their existing pay scales under the existing service condition till their promotion.
2. The quota of recruitment for the post of Assistant Engineer, which is at present 50 per cent should be raised to 75 per cent.
3. 25 per cent posts in the Sub-Engineer cadre by converted into selection grade posts and selection for the selection grade post should be made on the basis of merit-cum-seniority.
4. The quota prescribed for promotion of the Draftsmen should be reduced from 5 per cent to 3 per cent. Promotion quota of 2 per cent should be reserved for those Sub-Engineer/Draftsmen who obtain degree while in service.
5. The posts of Junior Engineer cadre, which presently exists, should be converted into the posts of Assistant Engineers and Sub-Engineers with the concurrence of the finance department.

Eventually, the State government decided on May 27, 1980 that the 941 posts of Junior Engineers in the Irrigation Department should be abolished by converting 658 of those posts into posts of Assistant Engineers and 283 posts into posts of Sub-engineers (Overseers). It must be, however, pointed out that, though the existing posts of JEs or SEs stood abolished from May 27, 1980, in fact, a number of Junior Engineers appointed earlier continued to function as before, under the memorandum of July 1979, until they received promotions as Assistant Engineers (AEs) in due course.

5. We now come to the details of the merger between the Corporation and the State Department. In August 1982 a decision was taken to abolish the Corporation. The government decided on the merger of the surplus staff of the Corporation in the Irrigation Department and October 8, 1982 was decided upon as the effective date of merger for all purposes. We are concerned have with the formula for transition set out in the opening para of a memorandum of the above date regarding the merger of the posts of STAs and JTAs. It read thus :

##2. Senior Technical Assistant Sanctioned posts. - Nil the above employees may be Equivalent Post - Junior merged in the posts of Junior Engineers and an Engineer (Rs. 350-650) equivalent number of posts may be deemed to have been 27 posts - Civil created in the dying of Junior 34 posts - Electrical Engineers. (Mechanical) 12 posts - Geologists 1 post - Geophysist 3. Junior Technical Assistant Sanction - 30 posts (reserved). These may be Equivalent post: Sub- merged against the posts of Engineer (Rs. 280-480) Junior Engineer. The posts reserved for Scheduled 62 posts - Civil Castes and Scheduled Tribes may be made unreserved and appointments may be made against them also.###

6. The memorandum of October 8, 1982 was followed up by a communication dated November 10, 1982. The enclosures to this letter described the absorptions as "ad hoc" but his words were deleted on January 29, 1983 with reference to the posts with which we are concerned, making it Technical clear that the absorption was to be permanent. The letter set out three conditions for the merger which admittedly are fulfilled by the appellants :

(i) The staff will be absorbed only subject to their fulfilling the qualifications prescribed for the posts against which they are to be absorbed :

(ii) The inter se seniority of the employees of the corporation shall be in accordance with the seniority list cleared by the Managing Director. The inter-seniority of the departmental employees and the employees of the Corporation shall be determined in accordance with the orders of the government, and

(iii) It was open to an employee of the Corporation to join the government department or not to do so, for the employees were to be required to join duties at the place of their posting within 20 days from November 10, 1982 failing which it was to be deemed that the appointment was not acceptable to them.

The seniority rule was announced much later, on April 16, 1984. It said :

"The regular officers/employees of the Corporation shall in the event of merger in the Irrigation Department, be considered as junior to the permanent officers/employees of the department and their seniority in the lists of the temporary officers/employees of the department, shall be fixed on the basis of the dates of assuming office, without affecting the inter se seniority of the Corporation."

7. The result of all this, according to the appellants, was that the STAs of the Corporation became, w. e. f. October 8, 1982, JEs of the department but their seniority therein was below the JEs of the State Department who had been in office in the 1979 and continued to function as such even thereafter. It is stated that these Junior Engineers in the department were being gradually promoted as AEs and it was only some time in 1984 that the appellants who were at the bottom of the seniority list became eligible for promotion as AEs. Their legitimate claims in this regard, it is alleged, were being stalled by the State and so the appellants filed a writ petition in the High Court in 1985.

8. Some time later, the appellants allege, it came to light that the State, far from giving the petitioners their legitimate entitlement, was planning a volte face to upset the whole scheme of merger as envisaged earlier, to the detriment of the applicants. This they did, it is said, by issuing a memo on March 1, 1986 which read thus :

"1. The State Government amends point No. 2 of paragraph 1 of the orders issued vide Irrigation Department's Memo No. 22 (C) /43/82/P/37 dated October 8, 1982 as followed :

#2. Senior Technical The above employees Assistant equivalent may be absorbed on to Junior Engineer the post of Sub- (Rs. 350-650) Engineer protecting the pay which they 27 posts - Civil were drawing previously. Such absorbed 34 posts - Electrical employees shall be eligible for promotion to the posts of AEs from the quota of Graduate Sub-Engineers.##

2. These orders shall come into effect from October 8, 1982."

This order vitally affected the interests of the appellants in four respects :

(a) Having been absorbed into the State Department as JEs in 1982, they were suddenly demoted to the post of SEs retrospectively with the "saving grace" that their pay was protected.

(b) Under the seniority rules of 1984 earlier referred to they were at the bottom of the list of JEs but above the Ses. But now they became juniors to all the Sub-Engineers of the Department;

(c) While previously a substantial quota for promotion from JEs to SEs was applicable to them, the quota now got reduced (as will be explained later) to 4 per cent; and

(d) while previously an experience of 2 years was sufficient for their promotion, now they had to have a minimum experience of 8 years (as will be seen later).

The combined effect of all this is, it is alleged, that the appellants will become eligible for consideration for promotion as AEs in the distant future as follows :

Year No of posts available to applicants 1989 1 1997 3 2004 2 2007 1 2008 1##

In other words, only 8 persons will become eligible at distant dates whereas all of the appellants should have received promotions gradually since 1985 as and when vacancies occurred. The appellants contend that this is a great travesty of justice which should be set right by quashing the decision of March 1, 1986 and restoring the position as it actually prevailed on October 8, 1982 at the time of the merger.

9. Sri Datar attempted to consider this - what prima facie appeared to be a just and reasonable - plea with his usual persuasiveness. He urged that the contentions of the appellants overlook four important basic facts and that, if these are kept in mind, it will be seen not merely that no injustice has been done to the appellant but that, in fact the State has come to their rescue by providing an avenue of promotion where none existed. These basic facts are, he says :

(1) As from May 27, 1980, there was no cadre of Junior Engineers at all in the State Service. That cadre had been abolished by the decision of 1979 and the conversion, on May 27, 1980, of the existing posits of JEs into those of AEs/SEs.

(2) There had been an amendment on July 25, 1981 to the relevant recruitment rules which made it clear that after that date at least, there could be no promotions to the posts of AEs from among JEs.

(3) When the Corporation was abolished in 1982, the State Government could have dispensed with the services of the appellants. Instead, they considered the appellants' cases sympathetically and decided to absorb them into the State service. In doing so, they purported to absorb them as JEs overlooking that, as on October 8, 1982, there was no cadre of JE in the State service. It is this mistake that was rectified on March 1, 1986 by absorbing the appellants as SEs (instead of as JEs) but protecting the pay

they were drawing.

(4) The petitioners had an option to join or not to join the State service on October 8, 1982 as JEs. When they decided to join they were aware that according to the rules prevailing on that date, there was no avenue of promotion for them as AEs.

10. The net result of these considerations is, says Sri Datar, that, instead of completely denying the appellants any promotion altogether (as they was no right, under the rules, to any such promotion), the State has, equitably, decided to confer on these officers a right of promotion by treating them as SEs. This was a generous gesture on the part of the State. The appellants should have been happy that an avenue for promotion had been opened out to them, instead of being disgruntled on the assumption that their promotion chances had dwindled by the action of the State. This was the only reasonable way of resolving the impasse that faced the appellants and the authorities.

11. Since Sri Datar has referred to the rules, it will be appropriate to pause here and notice the relevant service rules and the amendments made thereto. Taking up the Non-Gazetted Service Rules of 1969 first, they provided, in Schedule I - read with Rule 5 - for 269 posts of Civil Engineers and 13 posts of Electrical/Mechanical Engineers in the cadre of Junior Engineers. Curiously enough these rules appear to have remained unamended notwithstanding the decision of 1979 to abolish these posts and the office order of 1980 converting these posts (these appear to have numbered 941 at the relevant time) into AEs or Ss.

12. Turning next to the Gazetted Service Rules, the following provisions thereof are relevant :

7. Method of recruitment. - (1) Recruitment to the service, after commencement of the rules, shall be by the following methods, viz :

(b) by direct recruitment by selection;

(b) by promotion of substantive/officiating member of the M. P. Irrigation Engineering Service (Gazetted); and

(c) by transfer of persons who hold in a substantive capacity such posts in such services as may be specified in this behalf.

(2) The number of persons recruited under clause (b) or clause (c) of sub-rule (1) shall not at any time exceed the percentage shown in Schedule II of the number of duty posts (as specified in Schedule I).

(3) Subject to the provisions of these rules, the method or methods of recruitment to be adopted for the purpose of filling any particular period of recruitment, and the number of persons to be recruitment by each method, shall be determined on each occasion by the government in consultation with the Commission.

(4) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (1) if in the opinion of the government, the exigencies of the service so require, the government may, after consulting the General Administration Department, adopt such methods of recruitment to the service other than those specified in the said sub-rule, as it may by order issued in this behalf, prescribe.

15. Conditions of eligibility for promotions. - (1) Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2), the Committee shall consider the case of all persons who on the 1st day of January of that year had completed the prescribed years of service (whether officiating or substantive) in the post/service mentioned in column 2 of Schedule IV or any other post or posts declared equivalent thereto by the government as under and are with in the zone of consideration, as per sub-rule (2) -

(i) Sub-Engineers, Head Draftsman/Draftsman to the posts of Assistant Engineers - Minimum service of 12 years as Sub-Engineers, Head Draftsman/Draftsman :

Provided that a Sub-Engineer and Head Draftsman/Draftsman who has completed a minimum of 8 years' service and possesses degree in Civil/Electrical/Mechanical Engineering from recognised university or qualification declared equivalent thereto by the State Government, will also be eligible for promotion to the post of Assistant Engineer and will be considered each time just after the zone of consideration and then final selection list will be made from both the groups on the basis of merit. For example, if ten posts are vacant in the cadre of Assistant Engineer to be filled by promotion of Sub-Engineering, then $10 \times 5 = 50$ diploma holder Sub-Engineers from working list be considered first and thereafter the eligible graduate Sub-Engineers be considered in the order of their seniority for promotion.

(ii) Junior Engineers to the posts of Assistant Engineers minimum service of 2 years as Junior Engineer.

* *

18. Select list. - (1) The Commission shall consider the list prepared by the Committee along with the other documents received from the government and unless it considers any change necessary, approve the list.

(2) If the Commission considers it necessary to make any changes in the list received from the government the Commission shall inform the government of the changes proposed and after taking into account the comments, if any, as may in its opinion be just proper.

(3) The list as finally approved by the Commission shall form the select list for promotion of the members of the cadres of Sub-Engineers, Head Draftsman/Draftsmen, Research Assistant and junior Engineers of the M. P. Irrigation Engineering Service or its higher cadres, as the case may be.

(4) The select list shall ordinarily be enforced until it is reviewed or revised in accordance with sub-rule (4) of Rule 16, but its validity shall not be extended beyond a total period of 18 months from the date of its preparation :

Provided that, in the even of a grave lapse in the conduct of performance of duties on the part of any person included in the select list, a special review of the select list may be made at the instance of the government and the Commission, may, if it thinks fit, remove the name of such person from the select list".

13. Schedule I to the rules specified the number of posts in each cadre. So far as Assistant Engineers

(Class II) are concerned, the number of posts is put at 329 (253 permanent and 76 temporary) in the Civil Branch and 36 (22 permanent and 14 temporary) in the Electrical and Mechanical Branch. The description and contents of the relevant columns of Schedule II have to be set out a little more meticulously.

They read :

#Name Name Total No. of M.P. Irrigation Engg.of of duty posts P T T Service (Gazetted)Deptt. Service percentage of the number of duty posts to be filled in. By By By transfer of direct promo- persons from recruit- tion of other ment the service. sub- stantive members the service. [Vide [Vide [Vide Rule Rule Rule 7(c)] 7(a)] 7(b)(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)Civil AE, 253 76 329 50 0 25 perIrriga- Class centtion II byDept. promotion of JEs 20 per cent by promotion of SEs (previously Overseers) 5 per cent by promotion of Head Draftsman/ Draftsmen.Elect. -do- 22 34 36 50 50 As for AE& Mech.Branch##

Scheduled IV says that JEs (Class III) with minimum experience of two years as well as SEs and Head Draftsman/Draftsmen with 12 years' experience (8 years in the case of degree holders) will be eligible for promotion as AEs (Class II) on selection by a departmental committee constituted as specified therein.

14. The interesting feature regarding the amendments of 1981 relied upon by Sri Datar is that they left the rules quoted above and Schedules I and IV untouched. They only amended Schedule II in two respects :

(1) In the heading of column 5, the words "By promotion" were substituted for the words "By promotion of substantive members of the service [vide Rule 7 (b)]".

(2) The figures in columns 4 and 5 were substituted by the following in respect of both the Civil Branch and the Electrical/Mechanical Branch :

(4) (5)

60 40 33 per cent by SEs who are diploma holders;

4 per cent by SEs/Draftsmen who are Engineering Graduates.

3 per cent by Draftsmen/ Head Draftsman who are not Engineering Graduates.

15. We have considered the submissions of the parties in the light of the above rules and amendments and come to the conclusion that there is force in the contention of the appellants that they are eligible for promotion as AEs in the same manner as the erstwhile JEs of the Irrigation Department. The assumption of the respondents that the cadre of JEs had ceased to exist long before the absorption of the present appellants into the department is incorrect. As pointed out earlier, though the decision to abolish the cadre was taken in 1979 and the existing posts were converted into those of AEs/SEs on May 27, 1980, the cadre did not die, for the JEs of the department who were then functioning continued to function as before until they were promoted in due course as AEs. It is also not correct to say that this crucial "fact" had been overlooked at the time of passing the merger order of October 8, 1982. On the contrary, the State was fully conscious of its earlier decision and the order of October 8, 1982 specifically mentions that the posts of STAs will be

merged in the posts of JEs "and an equivalent number of posts may be deemed to have been created in the dying cadre of Junior Engineers". These words make it perfectly clear that the cadre of JEs was "dying" (but not dead) and the strength of the dying cadre was further enlivened by taking in the STAs of the Corporation as JEs. Thus, the position is that, as on October 8, 1982, the cadre of JEs continued to subsist and comprised of the old JEs of the Irrigation department and the STA engrafted from the Corporation. This conclusion is reinforced by the interesting circumstance that the reference in Schedule I of the Non-Gazetted Service Rules to JEs was not omitted despite the decisions as 1979 and 1980. It is true that the number of these posts was mentioned as 269 in the Civil Branch and 13 in the Electrical & Mechanical Branch. But the actual number had far exceeded these without a corresponding amendment in the Schedule. This, however, is inconsequential. Rule 6 of these Rules is in the following terms :

6. Method of recruitment. - (i) Recruitment to the service, after the commencement of these rules, shall be by the following methods, viz. -

(a) by direct recruitment, by selection/by competitive examination as shown in Schedule II,

(b) by promotion of substantive/officiating members of the service (as shown in the Schedule IV), and

(c) by promotion of persons who hold in a substantive capacity such posts in such service as may be specified in this behalf.

(ii) The number of persons recruited under clauses (b) and (c) of sub-rule (1) of the Rule 6 shall not at any time exceed the percentage shown in the Schedule II.

(iii) Subject to the provisions of these rules, the method/methods of recruitment to be adopted for the purpose of filling any particular vacancy/vacancies in the Service as may be required to be filled during any particular period of recruitment, and the number of persons to be recruited by each method, shall be determined on each occasion by the appointing authority.

(iv) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (i) if in the opinion of Engineer-in-Chief/Chief Engineer, the exigencies of the service so require, the said Engineer-in-Chief/Chief Engineer, may after consulting the government, adopt such methods of recruitment to the service other than those specified in the said sub-rule, as he may, by order issued in this behalf, prescribe.

Rule 6 (IV)

16. Counsel for the State contends that this conclusion would directly run contrary to the rules of the gazetted service particularly after their amendment in 1981 and that, after the date of said amendment, no AE could be recruited by promotion from among JEs. The objection on this account is twofold. The first, not clearly articulated by counsel, is that Rule 7 (b) permits recruitment by promotion only from among the members of the service and that a Non-Gazetted JE is not eligible for promotion. The second is that, after the 1981 amendment, JEs have been excluded as one of the sources of recruitment by promotion. We shall deal with these two objections one after another.

17. It is true that Rule 7 (b) of the Gazetted Service Rules of 1968 provides only for JEs belonging

to the said service being promoted as AEs. However, when the JE's post became a non-gazetted one in 1978, the relevant government orders made it clear that AEs will be recruited by promotion from among JEs to the extent of 25 per cent out of the 50 per cent quota available for promotion. The Schedule clearly mentioned this. As it also mentioned SEs and Head Draftsmen as other sources from which promotion could be made, the reference to JEs had been separately provided for as before. Thus, under the Schedule, non gazetted JEs were also clearly eligible for promotion despite the restriction in Rule 7 (b). This inconsistency between the Schedule and the rule was apparently noticed only in 1981 and the heading of column 5 of Schedule II was amended to make it clear that the promotions therein referred to were from the non-gazetted service, although Rule 7 (b) was left unamended. The omission to amend Rule 7, however, is not of much significance. It was open to the State, in view of Rule 7 (4), to promote members of the non-gazetted services also to the gazetted service to the extent of a prescribed quota. The restricted language of Rule 7 cannot, therefore, be construed in such a way as to render redundant the specific provision in the Schedule entitling several persons from the non-gazetted services to promotion.

18. It is then argued that, at any rate, after the amendment of the relevant columns of Schedule II in 1981, there is no right in any JE to claim promotion as AE. At least from that date, the promotional avenue for JEs stands abolished, claims Sri Datar. Sri Ashok Sen, for the petitioner, contended that the petitioners having been given a right, at the time of absorption in 1982, that they will be eligible for promotion in the same way as the erstwhile JEs of the State Department, this right cannot be taken away by invoking an earlier amendment of the rule. He cited some authorities in support of the proposition and pointed out that the petitioner had amended the original writ petition to include a prayer for quashing the amendments purportedly effected on July 25, 1981. On the other hand, Sri Datar contends that no employee has a vested right to promotion and that it was in law open to the government to change the conditions of service so as to take away a right to promotion that may have existed earlier. But, he pointed out, so far as the petitioners were concerned, there was no taking away of any right to promotion at all because, even as on October 8, 1982 when they claim to have become JEs, the rules provided for no promotional avenue at all and none was promised to them either by the order dated October 8, 1982.

19. We do not think it is necessary for us to express any views on the question whether an amendment taking away the rights of promotion earlier available to a cadre of employees is constitutionally valid. We shall proceed on the assumption as contended by the State, that this is permissible and that the effect of the amendment is that, on and from July 25, 1981, no AE can be recruited, under the amended Schedule, from among the JEs belonging to this cadre as had been in service with the State Department have continued to get their promotions even after the 1981 amendment. This is clear from the gradation list filed by the appellants which shows that three Junior Engineers were promoted as AEs on August 17, 1983. Further, the specific averments to this effect in the affidavits filed on behalf of the petitioners at various stages have not been denied. The petitioner have also placed on record an order dated October 18, 1985 which shows that a JE of the State Department in the Electrical & Mechanical Branch (perhaps the last of that category) was promoted as AE. If this be so, then, clearly, the department cannot discriminate as between officers belonging to the same cadre by promoting some of them and denying promotion to others. Sri Datar emphasised that the JEs belonging to the State service had a right of promotion earlier and this was continued even after the amendment whereas the appellants became JEs at a time when there was no further promotion available to them and that this makes all the difference. This argument runs somewhat contrary to the earlier argument of counsel that the amendment of 1981 should be treated as applicable to all claims for promotion after July 25, 1981 and that the State is at complete liberty to deny promotion after that date even in respect of those who may have earlier had a right to such

promotion. But even assuming that the distinction now sought to be pointed out by him marks a difference between the two categories of JEs on the cadre as on October 8, 1982, a discrimination between them would be totally arbitrary and contrary to the scheme of absorption envisaged in 1982. It cannot be resumed that the State, when it absorbed the STAs into the dying cadre of JEs, was unaware that (though, since 1981, there were no promotional avenues for JEs as AEs under the rules) the incumbents of that cadre were entitled to such promotion under the cabinet order dated July 5, 1979. The order of October 8, 1982 places the absorbed STAs into that "dying" cadre by creating fictionally an equal number of posts to accommodate the persons so absorbed. The intention and effect of the order of October 8, 1982 was to grant to all the STAs so absorbed exactly the same status as was enjoyed by those already in the cadre. In other words, if the JEs already existing in the cadre had a right of promotion, as on October 8, 1982, the new incumbents were also given that right; and if they had none after July 25, 1981, the new incumbents would have none they had none after July 25, 1981, the new incumbents would have none either. The State has admittedly proceeded on the footing that, despite the 1981 amendment, the JEs from the State Department were eligible for promotion; in fact, they have been promoted since 1979 as AEs as and when vacancies arose. This being so, any differential treatment of the absorbed STAs would clearly be discriminatory and unconstitutional. In interpreting these rules and government orders, one should bear in mind that the promotional stipulations in Schedule II should be read in the light of Rule 7 (4) which permits a wide latitude to the government in making recruitment, by way of promotion, even otherwise than in the manner outlined in Rule 7 (1). Reading the rules and the government orders issued from time to time harmoniously, the effect of the cabinet order of July 1979 was that all JEs, in position as such, should continue to be promoted until all of them became AEs. It is no doubt somewhat difficult to see how, after July 25, 1981, only a part of the pattern of recruitment in vogue earlier could stand side by side with that introduced on that date. One could have understood a stand on the part of the State that, as and from that date, promotions would be limited only to the new feeder categories and would not be available to any JE at all. But if the subsequent variation of 1981 did not override this benefit extended to the former State JEs in the cadre for promotion as per the cabinet order of 1979, it is difficult to see how a different rule could be applied to the STAs who have been absorbed too augment that cadre. The truth of the matter is that, when abolition of the cadre of JEs was thought of, the State decided that this should not affect the existing JEs and their promotional chances. Again, when the merger of the Corporation and State services was thought of, the decision was that the STAs should be placed on a par with the JEs of the State service and that the JTAs should be placed on par with the SEs. This was a conscious and equitable decision (for, as is common ground, the post of STA was equivalent to JE) and to go back upon it has resulted in arbitrary discrimination against the appellants. By the decision of 1986, they lose their status as JE (and are equated to SEs which is the status also accorded to the JTAs, their subordinates in the erstwhile Corporation), they lose their right to promotion, they lose seniority by being placed at the bottom of the SEs of the State service and the promotional quota now allotted to them is illusory. It is true that they had volunteered for absorption as JEs in 1982, a date when there was no promotional avenue to a JE under the rules. But they did so because they were told that they would be placed on par with the JEs in the State service and never imagined that they would be denied promotion on the basis of the amended rules while the JEs in the State service continued to get promotions despite the amendment. The fact that they opted for the State service does not, therefore, entitle the State to treat them differently from the JEs of the State service. We have, therefore, no doubt in our minds that gross injustice has been done to the appellants by the subsequent decision of the State Government. We, therefore, no doubt in our minds that gross injustice has been done to the appellants by the subsequent decision of the State Government. We, therefore, quash the decision of March 1, 1986 and direct that the appellants will be entitled to be considered for promotion as AEs

in the same manner and to the same extent as the JEs of the State service have been considered and not on the basis of the percentages prescribed for SEs under the amended rules. In the view taken by us that the rules and the amendment therein do not override the effect of the orders of July 5, 1979 and October 8, 1982, it is not necessary for us to pronounce any opinion on the validity of the 1981 amendment to the Rules.

20. The appeals succeed to the extent indicated above. There will be no order as to costs.

</html