

34. We are of the view that the Tribunal has come to a correct decision. The question referred by the Tribunal is in two parts. The first part of the question is answered in the affirmative and in favour of the Revenue. The second part of the question is answered in the negative and in favour of the Revenue.

35. The references are disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

b

(1997) 6 Supreme Court Cases 129

(BEFORE K. RAMASWAMY AND G.B. PATTANAIK, JJ.)

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.. Appellants;

Versus

c G.S. GILL AND ANOTHER

.. Respondents.

Civil Appeal No. 3005 of 1997[†], decided on March 27, 1997

A. Service Law — Reservations and Concessions — SCs and STs — Carry-forward rule — Validity — Carry forward of reserved vacancies for three recruitment years — Held, constitutionally permissible because its purpose is to secure adequate representation of reserved categories — The rule is however subject to ceiling of 50% reservation in a recruitment year but this ceiling does not apply where there is only one post — Constitution of India, Arts. 16(4) and 335

d

The issue before the Supreme Court was whether action of the appellant-State of applying reservation for SCs/STs to a single post was valid. According to roster point, the vacancy fell to the share of an SC candidate and therefore Respondent 2 was promoted. Respondent 1, who was a general category candidate contended that reservation could not be applied because it was a solitary post. He prayed for a mandamus or direction to the Government to dereserve the carried-forward post and to consider his case for promotion as a general candidate.

e

Held :

Carry-forward rule is constitutionally permissible. It is an extension of the principle of providing facility and opportunity to secure adequacy of the representation to SCs and STs mandated by Article 335. It should be carried forward for three years. Even in the post when the vacancy as per roster was available, but candidates were not available, same could be carried forward for three years. However, in each recruitment year, the carry-forward rule cannot exceed 50% of the vacancies. That question however does not arise in a situation where there is a single post/cadre. (Para 7)

f

B. Service Law — Reservations and Concessions — SCs and STs — Dereservation, held, is an administrative discretion — General category candidate has no right to seek dereservation — Direction or mandamus to Government for dereservation — Held, not to be issued — Constitution of India, Arts. 32 and 226 — Writs — Mandamus — When cannot be issued

h

[†] From the Judgment and Order dated 22-11-1995 of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in L P A No 351 of 1981

130

SUPREME COURT CASES

(1997) 6 SCC

Held :

Whether or not reserved vacancies should be dereserved, is a matter falling primarily within the administrative discretion of the Government. There is no right in general candidates to seek filling up of the vacancies belonging to the reserved category and to insist on dereservation of reserved vacancies so long as it is possible in law to fill up the reserved vacancies. Carried-forward (unfilled) vacancies reserved for SCs and STs should be filled up only by the reserved candidates and general candidates have no right to seek direction for dereservation thereof for filling up of the same by general candidates. In the instant case, Government issued orders to carry forward for two years. The direction or mandamus to dereserve the solitary post was clearly unconstitutional because no mandamus could be issued to disobey the law or prohibit the authorities from discharging the functions. It would, be therefore, manifestly illegal to seek a mandamus or direction; nor would the court be justified to issue such mandamus or direction to the appropriate Government to dereserve vacancy. (Para 7)

S.S. Sharma v. Union of India, (1981) 1 SCC 397 : 1981 SCC (L&S) 184 : AIR 1981 SC 588; *U.P. Sales Tax Service Assn. v. Taxation Bar Assn.*, (1995) 5 SCC 716, *Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief v. M.A. Rajani*, (1997) 4 SCC 276 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212, *relied on*

C. Service Law — Reservations and Concessions — SCs and STs — Roster — Applicability of, to a single post/cadre and promotion on the basis of roster — Constitutional validity — Held, valid — Constitution of India, Arts. 16(1) and 14

Reservation provided to single post on the basis of rule of rotation is not unconstitutional. Application of roster to a single post/cadre and appointment by promotion to a carry-forward post is also valid and constitutional. With a view to give adequate representation in public service to reserved category candidates, the opportunity given to them is not violative of Articles 14 and 16(1) of the Constitution. (Para 11)

Arati Ray Choudhury v. Union of India, (1974) 1 SCC 87 : 1974 SCC (L&S) 73; *Union of India v. Madhav*, (1997) 2 SCC 332 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 503 : JT (1997) 9 SC 320, *followed*

Parminder Kaur (Dr) v. State of Punjab, (1976) 1 SLR 502 (P&H), *impliedly overruled*

T. Devadasan v. Union of India, (1964) 4 SCR 680 : AIR 1964 SC 179 : (1965) 2 LLJ 560, *referred to*

Chakradhar Paswan (Dr) v. State of Bihar, (1988) 2 SCC 214 : 1988 SCC (L&S) 516 : (1988) 7 ATC 104, *explained and dissented*

Indra Sawhney v. Union of India, 1992 Supp (3) SCC 217 : 1992 SCC (L&S) Supp 1 : (1992) 22 ATC 385; *R.K. Sabharwal v. State of Punjab*, (1995) 2 SCC 745 : 1995 SCC (L&S) 548 : (1995) 29 ATC 481; *Ahmedabad St. Xavier's College Society v. State of Gujarat*, (1974) 1 SCC 717 : (1975) 1 SCR 173, *Pradeep Jain (Dr) v. Union of India*, (1984) 3 SCC 654; *Marri Chandra Shekhar Rao v. Dean, Seth G.S. Medical College*, (1990) 3 SCC 130 : (1990) 14 ATC 671; *Ashok Kumar Gupta v. State of U P*, (1997) 5 SCC 201 : (1997) 3 Scale 289, *Union of India v. Brij Lal Thakur*, (1997) 4 SCC 278 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212, *relied on*

D. Constitution of India — Art. 261 — Full faith and credit to be given to public acts — Faith when forfeited — Mala fide or colourable exercise of power — Bureaucratic acts designed to deprive SCs/STs of their legitimate rights to promotion and to favour general category candidates — Held, faith forfeited — Administrative Law — Colourable exercise of power — Mala fides — Service Law — Reservations and Concessions — SCs and STs — Carry-forward rule

Held :

- a It is a common knowledge that selections are not being made objectively to select the candidates belonging to the *Dalits* and Tribes to fill up the vacancies reserved for them though qualified candidates are available to be promoted/appointed. With a view to see that reserved vacancies are not filled up and the same are passed off as eligible candidates being not available so as to ensure that carry-forward vacancies either exceed 50% of the accumulated total vacancies or that selection goes beyond three years so as to make the Government deserve the vacancies. Such acts do not deserve faith reposed by Article 261 (Paras 7 and 8)

- b *Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Officers' Welfare Council v. State of U.P.*, (1997) 1 SCC 701 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 194; *Superintending Engineer, Public Health, U.T. Chandigarh v. Kuldeep Singh*, (1997) 9 SCC 199 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1044 : (1997) 2 Scale 138, *relied on*

Swamy Ranganathananda: "*Eternal Values for a Changing Society*", *quoted*

- c **E. Public Administration — Administrator — Duty to work as an enlightened citizen with national interests in view — Parochial considerations to be avoided — Constitution of India, Arts. 51-A(e), 51-A(j) and 38(1)**

Held :

- d Administrator is primarily a citizen and the State wants him to always remember that his vision should be of national interest and to act in concert with the Government. It will do him good to know what that means. Nobody is born an administrator but nobody is always a good administrator. The primary responsibility of an administrator is to perform his functions in the service of the nation as an enlightened citizen to strengthen a new democratic State. The public administrator should get rid off all mental observations on narrow considerations of caste, religion sectional or regional. He should have a wider concern for society as a whole. Otherwise he is not worthy to be an administrator or enlightened citizen to work for others. In public administration, responsibility is of highly personal and moral quality and is not necessarily related to formal status or power, although it is probably true that greater power brings greater responsibility. (Para 8)

F. Public Administration — Bureaucracy — Dynamic Bureaucracy — Held, is the one which discharges its functions to enrich integration of social structure by wise decisions (Para 9)

- f **G. Constitutional Law — State in a democratic society — Source of its strength, held, is the cooperative and dispassionate will of all as its free and equal citizens — Constitution of India, Preamble** (Para 9)

H. Public Administration — Responsibilities of — Implementation of rule of law and constitutional commands — Constitutional Law — Principles — Rule of law

Held :

- g The public administration is responsible for effective implementation of the rule of law and constitutional commands which effectuate fairly the objective standards set for adjudging good administrative decisions. (Para 8)

I. Public Administration — Departmental Head — Vicarious responsibility for the acts of subordinates

- h The departmental head is responsible for the actions of his subordinates, although in actual fact he is not responsible for their use of power which he must, of necessity, delegate to them. Legitimacy is primarily a feature of constitutional system. They possess this quality by virtue of general public support for their authority and may have it in greater or lesser degree. (Para 8)

132

SUPREME COURT CASES

(1997) 6 SCC

J. Public Administration — Bureaucracy and political executive — Collective responsibility of, to effectuate constitutional philosophy and public justice — Constitutional Law

Held :

The bureaucracy shares the collective responsibility with political executive to effectuate the constitutional philosophy and public justice. The administrative responsibility lies in giving shape and content not only to the policies laid down in the Constitution and by the political executive but also applies them in a given set of facts. (Para 8)

K. Judiciary — Role of, at the time of fallen rectitude and honesty and when bureaucracy fails to implement public policy and constitutional philosophy of achieving equality and protecting weaker sections — Held, the judiciary would be astute in declaration of law, judicial review or dispensation of justice — Constitution of India, Arts. 141, 142(1) and 14 — Administrative Law — Judicial review

Many of the functions which the modern State undertakes are designed to make opportunities more nearly equal for everybody and to protect weaker individuals from the rapacity of the strong. In these days of fallen rectitude and honesty in the performance of public duty the bureaucracy is too willing to sabotage public policy and constitutional philosophy. Judiciary/Tribunal would be astute in the declaration of law or in its solemn judicial review or dispensation of justice to issue directions or mandamus against the law or public policy. (Para 10)

Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief v. M.A. Rajani, (1997) 4 SCC 276 . JT (1997) 4 SC 212, *relied on*

L. Supreme Court Rules, 1966 — Or. XLV, R. 1 — Notice — Non-delivery of — Postal remarks “No such person” — Held, indicated avoidance of notice by the person to whom it was sent — Civil Procedure Code, 1908, Or. 5, R. 17 — General Clauses Act, 1897, S. 27

Appeal allowed

K-O-M/T/17847/CLA

Advocates who appeared in this case :

R.S. Sodhi and Darshan Singh, Advocates, for the Appellants;

Rajesh Kumar Sharma and Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocates, for the Respondents.

Chronological list of cases cited

on page(s)

1. (1997) 9 SCC 199 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1044 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1044 :
(1997) 2 Scale 138, *Superintending Engineer, Public Health, U.T. Chandigarh v. Kuldeep Singh* 136g
2. (1997) 5 SCC 201 : (1997) 3 Scale 289, *Ashok Kumar Gupta v. State of U.P.* 138d-e
3. (1997) 4 SCC 278 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212, *Union of India v. Brij Lal Thakur* 138d-e
4. (1997) 4 SCC 276 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212, *Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief v. M.A. Rajani* 137e
5. (1997) 2 SCC 332 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 503 : JT (1997) 9 SC 320, *Union of India v. Madhav* 137g, 138b-c, 138e
6. (1997) 1 SCC 701 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 194, *Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Officers' Welfare Council v. State of U.P.* 135e
7. (1995) 5 SCC 716, *U.P. Sales Tax Service Assn. v. Taxation Bar Assn.* 135c
8. (1995) 2 SCC 745 : 1995 SCC (L&S) 548 : (1995) 29 ATC 481, *R.K. Sabharwal v. State of Punjab* 138c
9. 1992 Supp (3) SCC 217 : 1992 SCC (L&S) Supp 1 : (1992) 22 ATC 385, *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* 134b-c, 138c-d

STATE OF PUNJAB v G S. GILL

133

10. (1990) 3 SCC 130 : (1990) 14 ATC 671, *Marri Chandra Shekhar Rao v. Dean, Seth G.S. Medical College* 138d-e
- a 11. (1988) 2 SCC 214 : 1988 SCC (L&S) 516 : (1988) 7 ATC 104, *Chakradhar Paswan (Dr) v. State of Bihar* 138a-b
12. (1984) 3 SCC 654, *Pradeep Jain (Dr) v. Union of India* 138d-e
13. (1981) 1 SCC 397 : 1981 SCC (L&S) 184 : AIR 1981 SC 588, *S.S. Sharma v. Union of India* 134g
14. (1976) 1 SLR 502 (P&H), *Parminder Kaur (Dr) v. State of Punjab* 133g-h, 134a, 134b
- b 15. (1974) 1 SCC 717 : (1975) 1 SCR 173, *Ahmedabad St. Xavier's College Society v. State of Gujarat* 138d
16. (1974) 1 SCC 87 : 1974 SCC (L&S) 73, *Arati Ray Choudhury v. Union of India* 133f, 137g, 138b
17. (1964) 4 SCR 680 : AIR 1964 SC 179 : (1965) 2 LLJ 560, *T. Devadasan v. Union of India* 134b-c, 134d-e

ORDER

- c 1. As per the Office Report dated 13-9-1996, notice sent to the first respondent was received back by the Registry with the postal endorsement "No such person" indicating avoidance thereof on his part. Consequently, he was set ex parte. The second respondent was directed to file counter-affidavit. Even today the first respondent is not appearing either in person or through counsel.
- d 2. Leave granted. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and the second respondent.
3. This appeal by special leave arises from the judgment passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh on 22-11-1995 in LPA No. 351 of 1981.
- e 4. The admitted facts are that the first respondent, a general candidate, was appointed as a Junior Technical Assistant in the Department of Industries of the State of Punjab. The post of Assistant Superintendent, Quality Marking Centre, (Textile), i.e., in the next promotional cadre, is the single post in that cadre. The said post was reserved for Scheduled Caste candidates as per the roster and in view of the judgment of this Court in *Arati Ray Choudhury v. Union of India*¹. Bhagat Ram, the second respondent
- f who was a qualified candidate was considered and duly promoted to the said post. The first respondent, feeling aggrieved, filed writ petition in the High Court seeking relief in the form of a mandamus or direction to the Government to dereserve the carried-forward post and to consider his case for promotion as a general candidate. He contended that since it was the solitary post, reservation in favour of a Scheduled Caste would amount to
- g 100% reservation violating Articles 16(1) and 14 of the Constitution. The learned Single Judge observed that he felt bound by the Division Bench judgment in *Parminder Kaur (Dr) v. State of Punjab*² wherein it was held that "a solitary vacancy in the relevant year cannot be treated as reserved one as that would amount to reservation of 100% in violation of Articles 14 and 16(1) of the Constitution". Thus though he was inclined to take the view that
- h
- 1 (1974) 1 SCC 87 : 1974 SCC (L&S) 73
- 2 (1976) 1 SLR 502 (P&H)

constitutionally it was permissible, in view of the Division Bench judgment in *Dr Parminder Kaur case*², he allowed the writ petition. On appeal, it was affirmed by the Division Bench. When the matter was carried to this Court, it set aside the order and remitted the matter to the High Court for reconsideration. The Division Bench by the impugned judgment held thus:

“Consequently, we are of the view that since it is a single post cadre, there could not be any reservation at all and the question of applicability of *Parminder Kaur case*² also does not arise on the facts of the present case.”

5. Thus this appeal by special leave.

6. The question for consideration, therefore, is whether the view taken by the High Court is correct in law. This Court in *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*³ has overruled the decision of the Constitution Bench in *T. Devadasan v. Union of India*⁴ declaring the carry-forward rule as unconstitutional. In paragraph 817 at page 739, it was held thus:

“We are of the respectful opinion that *on its own reasoning*, the decision *insofar as it strikes down the rule* is not sustainable. The most that could have been done in that case was to quash the appointments in excess of 50%, inasmuch as, as a matter of fact, more than 50% of the vacancies for the year 1960 came to be reserved by virtue of the said rule.”

(emphasis in original)

In paragraph 818, it was held thus:

“We may reiterate that a carry-forward rule need not necessarily be in the same terms as the one found in *Devadasan*⁴. A given rule may say that the unfilled reserved vacancies shall not be filled by unreserved category candidates but shall be carried forward as such for a period of three years. In such a case, a contention may be raised that reserved posts remain a separate category altogether. In our opinion, however, the result of application of carry-forward rule, in whatever manner it is operated, should not result in breach of 50% rule.”

7. Thus it could be seen that the carry-forward rule is constitutionally permissible. It is an extension of the principle of providing facility and opportunity to secure adequacy of the representation to Dalits and Tribes mandated by Article 335. It should be carried for three years. Even in the post when the vacancy as per roster was available, but candidates were not available, same could be carried forward for three years. However, in each recruitment year, the carry-forward rule cannot exceed 50% of the vacancies. That question does not arise in a situation where there is single post/cadre. In *S.S. Sharma v. Union of India*⁵ in paragraph 8 at page 592, this Court had held that the limited departmental competitive examination for recruitment of the members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for determination of eligibility for promotion is not invalid nor the Central

3 1992 Supp (3) SCC 217 : 1992 SCC (L&S) Supp 1 : (1992) 22 ATC 385

4 (1964) 4 SCR 680 : AIR 1964 SC 179 : (1965) 2 LLJ 560

5 (1981) 1 SCC 397 : 1981 SCC (L&S) 184 AIR 1981 SC 588

- Government be directed to de-reserve the vacancies meant for such members when it was found that suitable Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe
- a candidates were not available for inclusion within the field of selection. Whether or not reserved vacancies should be de-reserved is a matter falling primarily within the administrative discretion of the Government. There is no right in general candidates to seek filling up of the vacancies belonging to the reserved category and to insist on de-reservation of reserved vacancies so long as it is possible in law to fill the reserved vacancies. In other words,
 - b carried-forward (unfilled) vacancies reserved for Dalits and Tribes should be filled up only by the reserved candidates and general candidates have no right to seek direction for de-reservation thereof for filling up of the same by general candidates. It would thus be clear that carry-forward rule is a permissible constitutional rule. Carry forward would be done for three years. In this case, the Government issued orders to carry forward for “two years”.
 - c Therefore, the direction or mandamus to de-reserve the solitary post was clearly unconstitutional. This Court in *U.P. Sales Tax Service Assn. v. Taxation Bar Assn.*⁶ had held that no mandamus could be issued to disobey the law or prohibit the authorities from discharging the functions. It would, therefore, be manifestly illegal to seek a mandamus or direction; nor would the Court be justified to issue such mandamus or direction to the appropriate
 - d Government to de-reserve vacancy. It is common knowledge that selections are not objectively being made to select the candidates belonging to the Dalits and Tribes to fill up the vacancies reserved for them though qualified candidates are available to be promoted/appointed, with a view to see that reserved vacancies are not filled up and the same are passed off as eligible candidates being not available so as to ensure that carry-forward vacancies either exceed 50% of the accumulated total vacancies or that selection goes
 - e beyond three years so as to make the Government de-reserve the vacancies.
8. This Court in *Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Officers' Welfare Council v. State of U.P.*⁷ has considered the mandate of Article 261 of the Constitution which accords full faith and credit to the acts done by the executive and connects the Union and the States to further the goals set down in the Constitution. In para 12 this Court has pointed out in that behalf.
- f It was held that administrator is primarily a citizen and the State wants him to always remember that his vision should be of national interest and to act in concert with the Government. It will do him good to know what that means. Nobody is born an administrator but nobody is always a good administrator. The primary responsibility of an administrator is to perform his functions in the service of the nation as an enlightened citizen to
 - g strengthen a new democratic State. A dynamic bureaucracy is one which discharges the functions to enrich the integration of the social structure by wise decisions. The State in a democratic society derives its strength from the cooperative and dispassionate will of all as its free and equal citizens. The public administration is responsible for the effective implication of the
 - h
- 6 (1995) 5 SCC 716
7 (1997) 1 SCC 701 · 1997 SCC (L&S) 194

rule of law and constitutional commands which effectuate fairly the objective standard set for adjudging good administrative decisions. The public administrator should rid off all mental observations on narrow considerations of caste, religion — sectional or regional. He should have wider concern for society as a whole. Otherwise he is not worthy to be an administrator or enlightened citizen to work for others; and consequently “there is every chance of this enlightenment getting eroded and self-interest ruling supreme. And once this erosion takes place, they slide slowly down and join the third group (demons manavarakshasas) among whom are found all those who indulge in all sorts of social malpractices, like bribery, corruption, tax evasion, smuggling, food and drug adulteration ... and fourth category become sheer vandals”. “God dwells in all — this great truth had never been translated into the wide social and economic fields or transformed into a social fact of human awareness affecting millions.” “This should be made a reality in modern democracy, political, economic and social” quoted from “*Eternal Values for a Changing Society*” by Swamy Ranganathananda. In public administration, responsibility is of highly personal and moral quality and is not necessarily related to formal status or power, although it is probably true that greater power brings greater responsibility. The departmental head is responsible for the actions of his subordinates, although in actual fact, he is not responsible for their use of power which, he must, of necessity, delegate to them. Legitimacy is primarily a feature of the constitutional system. They possess this quality by virtue of general public support for their authority and may have it in greater or lesser degree. The bureaucracy shares the collective responsibility with political executive to effectuate the constitutional philosophy and public justice. The administrative responsibility lies in giving shape and content not only to the policies laid down in the Constitution and by the political executive but also applies them in a given set of facts. There, on the facts, it was found that the bureaucracy had by mala fide actions issued successive orders to deprive certain Dalit and Tribal doctors of their chances of promotion by colourable exercise of power depriving them of their right to promotion. Soon after the selection, they were withdrawn. Further orders were issued in favour of the general candidates with most favourable conditions. Thereby, the bureaucracy forfeited the full faith and credit which Article 261 trusted them with. Therefore, this Court set aside the action and directed reconsideration of their cases.

9. In *Superintending Engineer, Public Health, U.T. Chandigarh v. Kuldeep Singh*⁸, though reserved candidate was available, the post was de-reserved and he was not selected. When he filed a petition in the Administrative Tribunal it was allowed and direction was given to consider his case in accordance with the rules. When the appeal was filed in this Court, it was held that the authorities have power coupled with duty.

“Every public servant is a trustee of the society and in all facets of public administration, every public servant has to exhibit honesty,

a integrity, sincerity and faithfulness in implementation of the political, social, economic and constitutional policies to integrate the nation, to achieve excellence and efficiency in the public administration. A public servant entrusted with duty and power to implement constitutional policy under Articles 16(4), 16(4-A), 15(4) and 335 and all interrelated directive principles should exhibit transparency in implementation and should be accountable for due effectuation of constitutional goals.”

b It was directed that the reservation and carry-forward rule should be implemented in true spirit. It is settled legal principle that when bureaucracy has power coupled with a duty to implement the law and constitutional goal. State should be envisaged as a canal through which the fruits of constitutional principles, philosophy and the backed-up law may flow, releasing its energy for the benefit of the people rather than as a dam to hold it back or cause breach thereof to frustrate the goals. After all, the basic task
c any philosophy of government is to figure out is what the State must do, not what it would be prohibited from doing. Nor is it to be forgotten that while tyrannical governments destroy the freedom, constitutional government would enlarge the freedom.

d 10. Many of the functions which the modern State undertakes are designed to make opportunities more nearly equal for everybody and to protect weaker individuals from the rapacity of the strong. In these days of fallen rectitude and honesty in the performance of public duty and the bureaucracy is too willing to sabotage public policy and constitutional philosophy. Judiciary/Tribunals should be astute in the declaration of law or in its solemn judicial review or dispensation of justice to issue directions or mandamus against the law, constitutional comments or public policy. In *Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief v. M.A. Rajani*⁹ this Court held that since the reservation was called for selection in a reserved vacancy and since the candidate was available, resort to de-reservation of the vacancy thereafter was clearly illegal. It would, therefore, be clear that the authorities are to implement the rule, executive/legislative/constitutional policy or principle in true spirit, honesty and sincerity to effectuate the policy; no mandamus or
e direction should be issued to de-reserve the carry-forward vacancies reserved for appointment of the Scheduled Castes and Tribes nor direction be given to fill up with general candidates.
f

g 11. The next question for consideration is whether reservation in promotion to a single post is unconstitutional being violative of Articles 16(1) and 14 of the Constitution. In *Arati Ray Choudhury case*¹ a Constitution Bench had held that reservation in promotion to a single post is not unconstitutional. This Court had re-surveyed the case-law in *Union of India v. Madhav*¹⁰. In paragraph 10 at page 338, it has been held that:

h “... we hold that even though there is a single post, if the Government have applied the rule of rotation and the roster point to the vacancies that had arisen in the single point post and were sought to be

9 (1997) 4 SCC 276 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212

10 (1997) 2 SCC 332 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 503 · JT (1997) 9 SC 320

138

SUPREME COURT CASES

(1997) 6 SCC

filled up by the candidates belonging to the reserved categories at the point on which they are eligible to be considered, such a rule is not violative of Article 16(1) of the Constitution.”

a

Same view has been reiterated in several subsequent judgments. In *Chakradhar Paswan (Dr) v. State of Bihar*¹¹ the ratio clearly is an authority for the proposition that two unequal posts carrying different scales of pay cannot be fused together for the purpose of applying the rule of reservation in promotion. That case stands on entirely a different footing but the ratio therein was misapplied to a case of reservation to a single post without following the Constitution Bench judgment in *Arati Ray Choudhury case*¹. That position was clarified in *Madhav case*¹⁰. Thus it is settled legal position that application of roster to single post cadre and appointment by promotion to carry-forward post is valid and constitutional. With a view to give adequate representation in public service to reserved category candidates, the opportunity given to them is not violative of Articles 14 and 16(1) of the Constitution. In *R.K. Sabharwal v. State of Punjab*¹² it was held that promotions in accordance with roster are valid and constitutional. Even in *Indra Sawhney case*³ this Court had reiterated the view that reservation for the Dalits and Tribes is as a class but not as individuals and, therefore, such a reservation is not violative of Article 14 or 16(1) of the Constitution. In *Ahmedabad St. Xavier's College Society v. State of Gujarat*¹³ a nine-Judge Bench had held that the fundamental rights should be broadly interpreted to enable the citizen to enjoy them. Same view was reiterated in *Pradeep Jain (Dr) v. Union of India*¹⁴; *Marri Chandra Shekhar Rao v. Dean, Seth G.S. Medical College*¹⁵ and *Ashok Kumar Gupta v. State of U.P.*¹⁶ In *Union of India v. Brij Lal Thakur*¹⁷ this Court following *Madhav case*¹⁰ has held that reservation provided to single post on the basis of rule of rotation is not unconstitutional. The High Court, therefore, is clearly in error in holding that reservation in promotion to a single post and application of carry-forward rule and of roster is unconstitutional.

b

c

d

e

f

11 (1988) 2 SCC 214 : 1988 SCC (L&S) 516 : (1988) 7 ATC 104

12 (1995) 2 SCC 745 : 1995 SCC (L&S) 548 : (1995) 29 ATC 481

13 (1974) 1 SCC 717 : (1975) 1 SCR 173

14 (1984) 3 SCC 654

15 (1990) 3 SCC 130 . (1990) 14 ATC 671

16 (1997) 5 SCC 201 : (1997) 3 Scale 289

17 (1997) 4 SCC 278 : JT (1997) 4 SC 212

g

h

V GANGARAM v. REGIONAL JOINT DIRECTOR

139

12. The appeal is accordingly allowed. The judgment of the Division Bench and of the learned Single Judge stand set aside. No costs.

a

(1997) 6 Supreme Court Cases 139

(BEFORE K. RAMASWAMY AND D.P. WADHWA, JJ.)

V. GANGARAM

.. Appellant;

b

Versus

REGIONAL JOINT DIRECTOR AND OTHERS

.. Respondents.

Civil Appeal No. 3297 of 1997[†], decided on April 25, 1997

c **A. Service Law — Recovery — Excess amount paid by mistake — Extent up to which recoverable — The appellant entitled to two increments for acquiring additional qualifications but more than two increments granted to him — Held on facts, arrears paid prior to 1985 not to be recovered but the amount paid from 1985 liable to be recovered from the appellant (Para 7)**

B. Service Law — Recovery — Mode of recovery of excess amount paid — On facts held, excess amount to be recovered from pension in instalments to be distributed proportionately so as not to cause any undue hardship — Pension (Para 7)

d

C. Service Law — Pension — Recovery from — Permissibility — Excess amount paid to the appellant as additional increments, permitted to be recovered proportionately from his pension — Pensions Act, 1871, S. 11

Ordered accordingly

K-O-M/T/17889/CLA

Advocates who appeared in this case :

e **D. Prakash Reddy and Ms D.B. Reddy, Advocates, for the Appellant;**
T. Anil Kumar, Advocate, for the Respondents.

ORDER

1. Leave granted.

2. We have heard the learned counsel on both sides.

f **3.** This appeal by special leave arises from the order of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal at Hyderabad, made on 19-8-1996 in OA No. 2944 of 1993.

g **4.** The appellant was originally appointed as a Teacher/Headmaster in a private aided school on 9-11-1959 in the scale of Rs 45-120. After his passing Secondary Grade Degree Training Examination in the year 1967, he was granted on 1-12-1967 SGBT scale of Rs 80-150 w.e.f. the aforesaid date. In view of the fact that the appellant went on improving his qualifications by BA, MA, B.Ed. and M.Ed., the authorities went on giving revision of the pay scale granting advance increments as and when he acquired the qualification on the pay scale applicable at the relevant time. The impugned proceedings were issued to recover the said amount paid to

h

[†] From the Judgment and Order dated 19-8-1996 of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad in O.A. No 2944 of 1993