

**MINUTES OF THE 12TH MEETING HELD ON 15/10/2009
AT 2:30 P.M. IN ROOM NO. 190, NORTH BLOCK, NEW
DELHI UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF JS (A&AT&SR).**

In compliance to the directions dated 17.04.2007 of the Hon'ble High Court of Chhattisgarh at Bilaspur in Writ Petition No. 445/2001 in the matter of Shri Godbole & Ors. V/s Union of India & Ors., the 12th meeting of the Committee was held under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.K. Sarkar, Joint Secretary (A&AT&SR), DoPT at 2:30 P.M. in Room No. 190, North Block, New Delhi. The meeting was attended by the following:-

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Shri Sudesh Kumar | Principal Secretary, GAD, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh |
| Shri Jawahar Srivastava | Secretary, GAD, Government of Chhattisgarh |
| Shri V. Peddanna | Deputy Secretary, DOPT (SRS) |
| Shri M.L. Jain | Deputy Director (Agri.), Govt. of Madhya Pradesh |

2. The Chairman welcomed the members of the Committee and thereafter took up the agenda of the meeting for discussion. In the meeting, representations of 12 State Govt. employees of erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh, covered by the decision dated 17.04.2007 in W.P. No. 445/2001, were individually discussed for revision of their allocation of State Cadre. The brief record of discussion and recommendation of the Committee in each has been reflected in the last column of the table:

Sl. No.	Name of the Petitioner	W.P. No.	Recommendations
1.	Shri Dilip Kumar Singh, Constable (GD)	2399/2008	The petitioner belongs to non-state cadre and he was working in Chhattisgarh as on 01.11.2000. As per policy the non-state cadre employees stand allocated to the state where they were working as on the appointed date. As such his allocation is in accordance with the guidelines of the allocation. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection of his representation.
2.	Shri Dayaveer Singh, Head Constable (GD)	2658/2008	As above
3.	Shri Narayan Das Yadav, Head Constable (GD)	2399/2008	As above
4.	Shri Chintamani Mishra, Revenue Inspector	276/2002	As above
5.	Jagdish Prasad Amrodia, Revenue Inspector	861/2008	As above

M. S. ...

	Shri Kumar Mishra, Revenue Inspector	861/2008	The petitioner belongs to non-state cadre and he was working in Chhattisgarh as on 01.11.2000. As per policy the non-state cadre employees stand allocated to the state where they were working as on the appointed date. As such his allocation is in accordance with the guidelines of the allocation. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection of his representation.
7.	Laung Singh Mahale, Revenue Inspector	197/2007	As above
8.	Shri Lal Singh Jamare, RAEO, D/o Agriculture	3177/2008	The petitioner belongs to the non-state cadre. Further the Lung disease of his father is not covered by the guidelines of allocation. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection of his representation.
9.	Shri Ram Singh Verma, RAEO, D/o Agriculture	2024/2008	The father of the petitioner is physically handicapped and this ground is not covered by the guidelines. As per guidelines of allocation the revision of allocation on the basis of physical handicap is restricted to employee himself. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection of his representation.
10.	Shri Mahesh Purohit, Asstt. Gr-I, D/o Women & Child Development	2394/2008	The petitioner claimed for revision of allocation to Madhya Pradesh based on wife's heart disease. Since the ground is not covered by the policy guidelines of allocation, the Committee recommended for rejection of his representation.

M. Prasad, s.d.

263

	D/o Public Health	2397/2008	The Committee noted that Smt. Archana Asthana, wife of the petitioner is working as an Assistant Teacher in Government Girl School, in Gwalior since 09.07.1990. Since the case is covered under the guidelines of spouse policy, the Committee recommended to accept the representation of the petitioner for revision of his allocation to Madhya Pradesh.
12.	Shri Rajendra Prasad Sharma, Supervisor, D/o School Education	2874/04	This case was earlier considered by the Committee held on 11.01.2008 and decided to allocate him the State of Chhattisgarh if he was not allocated to any of the states. In consideration of fact that the petitioner was allocated to the State of Madhya Pradesh in 2002, his allocation was to be revised from Madhya Pradesh to Chhattisgarh as per policy and his option. Hence the Committee decided to re-allocate the petitioner from Madhya Pradesh to Chhattisgarh in modification to its earlier decision dated 11.01.2008.

3. The representatives of the State Government informed that representations of a few petitioners are still to be considered by the Committee. Hence the Committee decided to convene its one more meeting for considering the representations of such petitioners.

4. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

M. S. S. S.