S.No-19(I)

F.No. 14/03/2006-SR(S)/ Vol.-IV
Government of India
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
(Department of Personnel & Training)
***

3rd Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan,
Khan Market, New Delhi – 110003,
the 26th October, 2012,

26 OCT 2012

To

The Principal, Secretary,
General Administration Department,
Government of Madhya Pradesh,
Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal,
Madhya Pradesh – 462004.

The Principal Secretary,
General Administration Department,
Government of Chhattisgarh,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh – 492002.

Sub.: - Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the Committee held on 1st October, 2012 at 11:00 A.M. in Conference Room No. 315, Vallabh Bhawan, Madhya Pradesh under the Chairmanship of Shri Manoj Joshi, Joint Secretary (AT & A & SR).

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the above mentioned subject and to forward herewith a copy of the Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the Committee held under the Chairmanship of Shri Manoj Joshi, Joint Secretary (AT & A & SR) on 1st October, 2012 at 11:00 AM in Conference Room No. 315, Vallabh Bhawan, Madhya Pradesh regarding consideration of the representations of State Government employees in compliance with the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh and other representations of employees under SC/ST category and spouse policy etc., for information and necessary action.

Encls.: As mentioned above

Yours Faithfully,

(M.S. Sharma)
Under Secretary SR(S)
☎ - 24651898

Copy to:

The Principal Secretary:

1. D/o Water Resources, Bhopal (M.P.)
2. D/o Water Resources, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. D/o Panchayat & RD, Bhopal (M.P.)
4. D/o Panchayat & RD, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
5. D/o Horticulture & Food Processing, Bhopal (M.P.)
6. D/o Public Health Engineering, Bhopal (M.P.)
7. D/o Public Health Engineering, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
8. D/o Home, Bhopal (M.P.)
9. D/o Home, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
10. D/o Social Justice, Bhopal (M.P.)
11. D/o Social Justice, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
12. D/o Commerce & Industry, Bhopal (M.P.)
13. D/o Commerce & Industry, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
14. D/o Public Health, Bhopal (M.P.)
15. D/o Farmers' Welfare & Agriculture Development, Bhopal (M.P.)
16. D/o Agriculture, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

Copy also to:

1. PS to JS (AT & A & SR)
2. PS to DS (SR)

कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग, लोक नायक भवन
Deptt. of Personnel & Trg., L. N. Bhawan
प्राप्ति और निर्गम अनुभाग
Receipt & Issued Section
26 OCT 2012
जारी किया/ISSUED

MINUTES OF THE 21ST MEETING OF STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, MADHYA PRADESH HELD ON 01ST OCTOBER, 2012 AT 11.00 AM IN COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 315, VALLABH BHAWAN, BHOPAL, MADHYA PRADESH, UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF JS (AT&A)

In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Courts of Chhattisgarh and Madhya, Pradesh the 21st Meeting of the State Advisory Committee was held under the Chairmanship of Shri Manoj Joshi, Joint Secretary (AT & A), DOPT on 01/10/2012 at 11.00 AM in Committee Room No. 315, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh to consider the representations of the petitioners and employees of State of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. The list of attendants is enclosed at Annexure "A".

2. The Chairman welcomed the members of the Committee and thereafter took up the agenda of the meeting for discussion. The Committee considered 112 cases and decision of the Committee in each individual case has been reflected in the last column of the table.

Sl No.	Name, Designation & W.P. No.	Present Status
1	V K Mahajan, Sub-Engineer, WRD (WP No.4796/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as all the grounds raised by him in his representation are not covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by the issuing speaking order giving cogent reasons for all the grounds raised by him.
2	Prafful Desawal, Sub-Engineer, WRD (WP No. 5729/06)	The Committee noted that the petitioner inter-alia has raised the ground in his representation that he was allocated to Chhattisgarh in the pay scale of Rs. 8000-13500 where he got this scale on 20/09/2006 as he was under suspension. This fact was confirmed by his Administrative Department in the meeting. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend his re-allocation from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 6500-10500 as per his eligibility in the category of A/4.
3	Om Prakash Tour, Sub-Engineer (WP No. 5313/06)	The main contention of the petitioners is that as they belong to SC and are domicile of Madhya Pradesh, they should be allocated to Madhya Pradesh. The Principal Secretary, WRD informed the Committee that the Chhattisgarh Government issued an order stating that the benefit of reservation to the dependent of SC/ST employees, for admission in the State Government institutions having domicile of M.P., allocated to Chhattisgarh is available if their castes are notified in both the successor States. As per their order dated 6th July, 2004, caste certificate would be issued in Chhattisgarh in such cases and benefit of reservation would be

(75)

		available to the employees as well as to their dependents. The Committee was informed that the petitioner in present case belongs to 'Jatav' Caste which is also notified in the State of Chhattisgarh and he himself and his dependents can't be denied the benefit of reservation in that State. The Committee was not convinced with the statement of Principal Secretary, WRD as benefit of the reservation is restricted to the area/ domicile of the individual and this benefit can't be carried on with the migration from one state to another. The Administrative Department has refuted claims on other grounds of the petitioners for re-allocation of their services to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons. The Committee decided to defer the consideration of following cases and recommended to seek clarification from the Reservation Division of DoPT in the matter. Srl. No. Name 3 – Om Prakash Tour, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 5313/06) 6 – Kamal Singh Sisodia, Asstt. Engineer (W.P. No. 2763/06) 8 – Satish Kumar Pandey (W.P. No. 2465/06) 17- Roop Basant Jarvade, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No.2420/08) 19– Trilok Chandra Sanwale, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 6444/06) 24 – L B Bamoria, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 336/06) 25 – Har Kishore Malviya, Asstt. Engineer (W.P. No. 7217/06) 55 – A. S. Parihar, Sub-Engineer(W.P. No. 61/06) 56 – S.K. Rai, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 62/06) 60– Manoj Kumar Kalosiya, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 15011/06) 62 – H P Malhotra, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No. 60/06) 99 - Vijay Kumar Mohase, Asstt. Engineer 100 - Gya Deen Kori, Sub-Engineer 101 - Prakash Chandra Sankala, Sub-Engineer
4	Alok Prasad Chaudhary, Sub Engineer, WRD (W.P. No. 5735/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department and they refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning cogent reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. One of the contentions of the petitioners is that juniors have been allocated to Madhya Pradesh state. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
5	Yogesh Kumar Sharma, Sub-Engr. WRD (6605/06)	The Committee noted that the mother of the petitioner is suffering from liver cancer and he is eligible for allocation to the State of M.P. as per the existing guidelines. On the recommendation of his Administrative Department the Committee recommended the re-allocation of the petitioner from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. under medical hardship category as his dependent mother is covered as a family member as per the definition of family.

(76)

6	Kamal Singh Sisodiya, Assistant Engineer (W.P. 2763/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belong to SC and domicile of Madhya Pradesh, he should be allocated to Madhya Pradesh State. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue regarding the accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the 1st instance as explained at sr.No.3. The Administrative Department has refuted the claim of the petitioner on other grounds for re-allocation of his services to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons.
7	Mahesh Chandra Vyas, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 3106/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning cogent reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee, none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by the issuing a detailed speaking order.
8	Satish Kumar Pandey , Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No.6425/06)	Main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue regarding the accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the 1st instance. The Administrative Department has refuted the claim of the petitioner on other grounds for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning proper reasons.
9	Shiv Shankar Gupta, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 4145/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. One of the contentions of the petitioners is that juniors are allocated to MP. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
10	Shyam Sunderani, Sub-Engineer. WRD	In compliance with the directions dated 14/12/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner

	(WP No. 8610/09)	was examined by his Administrative Department. The main contention of the petitioner is that his juniors were allocated to MP. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
11	Mohan Singh Nokan, Sub-Engineer, WRD (WP No.4491/06)	On the recommendation of the Principal Secretary of Administrative Department, who attended the meeting, the Committee decided to recommend his re-allocation from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. on the ground that he suffered two heart attacks and is under treatment of Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) and triple vessel disease. The case is covered under Medical Hardship Policy.
12	Nath Das Gupta, Sub-Engineer, WRD (WA 396/11)	The Committee considered the representation made earlier by the petitioner in the light of directions dated 13/03/2012 on the basis of comments furnished by the Administrative Department of the petitioner. The main contention of the petitioner is that his juniors were allocated to MP. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. The grounds raised by the petitioner do not entitle the petitioner for allocation to the State of M.P. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend his representation for rejection. The petitioner will be communicated about rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
13	Bhupendra Kumar Kachota, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No.3122/05)	The Committee considered the representation made earlier by the petitioner in the light of directions dated 13/03/2012 on the basis of comments furnished by the Administrative Department of the petitioner. The main contention of the petitioner is that his juniors were allocated to MP. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning cogent reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. The grounds raised by the petitioner do not entitle the petitioner for allocation to the State of M.P. The Committee therefore, decided to recommend his representation for rejection. The petitioner will be communicated about rejection of his representation by issuing a speaking order.
14	Ravindra Singh Parihar, Sub-Engineer, WRD , WA No. 413/11	On the request of Administrative Department the consideration of this case was deferred by the committee as the Judgement dated 13/08/2008 of Double Judges Bench in W.A. No. 783/07 in the matter of R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others has bearing on this case because of allocation of juniors to M.P. in

Mohinder Singh

		lower pay scale.
15	Arvind Chandel, Sub-Engineer, WRD (W.P. No. 6154/06)	On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner for change of State cadre from Chhattisgarh to M.P. from the category A/3 viz. "domicile" to A/4 viz. "Junior most" was rejected because on the appointed day the service records were showing that petitioner was a domicile of Chhattisgarh though his request for change of domicile was registered in his Administrative office prior to the appointed day.
16	R K Sanghvi, Sub-Engr.,WRD (W.P. No. 3413/08)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that his allegation of the petitioner that his juniors were allocated to MP. is not correct because the juniors named by him were allocated to M.P. under specific provisions under policy viz. Mutual transfers, spouse policy, medical hardship etc. The Committee did not accept the ground that the petitioner is suffering from chronic hepatitis for re-allocation of his services as the said disease is not covered for change of State cadre. Therefore, the Committee decided to recommend the representation of the petitioner for rejection for his re-allocation.
17	Roop Basant Jarvade, Sub Engineer , WRD (W.P. No. 2420/08)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claims of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance as explained at Sl.No.3.
18	Nand Lal Rathore, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 6458/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons for allocation of juniors to M.P. but they did not brought to the notice of the Committee about the claim of the petitioner for allocation for M.P. on the ground that his daughter is 50% handicapped due to cerebral Palsy. So, the Committee decided to defer the consideration of this case.
19	Trilok Singh Sawale, Sub-Engineer, WRD (W.P. No. 6444/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and his domicile state is MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. on other grounds by assigning valid reasons. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance as explained at Sl.No.3.

		assigning valid reasons. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance as explained at Sl.No.3.
20	Gagan Kumar Gaur, AG II (WP No. 5528/06)	The Administrative Department refuted the claim of the petitioner for change of State cadre of petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. on the basis of grounds raised by him in his representation. The petitioner did not mention the names of the Assistants, who were got higher scale of Rs. 4500-10000, and were not allocated to Chhattisgarh being junior in the said scale. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend the representation of the petitioner for rejection. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
21	Umesh Kulkarni, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 5385/08)	On the recommendation of Principal Secretary of Administrative Department, the Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. on the ground that his dependent family member is suffering from schizophrenia.
22	Balkrishan Kayarkar, Sub-Engineer. WRD (W.P. No. 823/06)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons. On the recommendation of Administrative Department, the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
23	M K Mansuri, Sub-Engr. (1887/08)	The Administrative Department refuted the claim of the petitioner for change of State cadre on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. They clarified in the meeting that 52 junior Sub-Engineers named by him have been allocated to M.P. under mutual transfer policy. Regarding his mutual transfer with Shri K K Saxena, it was clarified that their application for mutual transfer was not received by Administrative Department. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation for change of State allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
24	L B Bamoria, Sub Engineer (336/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claims of the

		petitioner on other grounds for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
25	Har Kishor Malviya, Assistant Engrineer (7217/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claims of the petitioner on other grounds for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning valid reasons to the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue is relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
26	Devendra Kumar Sharma, Sub-Engr. (3673/08)	All the grounds raised by the petitioners were examined by his Administrative Department. They also informed the Committee that his juniors named by him were allocated to M.P. under specific provisions under the policy. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation as the grounds raised by him for his re-allocation are not covered under the policy of State re-allocation. A detailed speaking order may be issued by Govt. of India.
27	N K Garg, Sub-Engr. (5549/08)	All the grounds raised by the petitioner have been examined by his Administrative Department and none of them is covered under the guidelines for re-allocation. Hence, they refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation. A detailed speaking order may be issued by Govt. of India.
28	P N Mahajan, Sub-Engr. (94891/06)	Administration Department refuted the claims of the petitioners as details of junior employees said to have been allocated to MP has not been given in the representation. Committee, therefore, recommended to reject his representation. Govt. Of India may issue a detailed speaking order.
29	Narendra Singh Yadav, Sub-Engr. (2710/05 & WA No. 235/11)	On the request of Administrative Department the consideration of this case was deferred by the committee as the Judgement dated 13/08/2008 of Double Judges Bench in W.A. No. 783/07 in the matter of R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others has a bearing on this case because of allocation of juniors to M.P. in lower pay scale.
30	Rajeev Ranjan Khare, Sub-Engineer. (WP No.15326/07)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the

		Committee as all the grounds raised by him in his representation are not covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
31	S R Singh, Sub-Engineer. WRD, (WP No. 9012/07)	The Administrative Department informed that the Writ Petition No. 9012/07 has been disposed of and speaking order was passed in compliance with directions dated 30/07/07. They further informed that the petitioner has filed another W.P. No. 16845/07 and the Hon'ble Court is still to dispose of the said petition. At present no further action is required as counter affidavit has already been filed by the Government of India.
32	R K Srivastava, Sub-Engineer. WRD (W No. 26/06)	All the grounds raised by the petitioner have been examined by his Administrative Department and none of them is covered under the guidelines for re-allocation. Hence, they refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation. A detailed speaking order may be issued by Govt. of India.
33	Ashok Kumar Verma, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 2227/05)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the mutual transfer of the petitioner has been decided and he has been allocated to M.P. The Committee noted that no further action is called for on the direction of the High Court .
34	Suresh Chandra Khandesh, Sub-Engineer. (WP No. 2831/05)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that they have filed Writ Appeal No. 345/ 07 against the judgment dated 14/09/06 passed in W.P. No. 2831/05 by the Hon'ble High Court. No further action is required at present in this case.
35	Sanjay Nigam, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 3606/05)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner has expired and no further action is required in this case.
36	Vijay Kumar Khatri, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No.3034/05)	In compliance with the directions dated 01/07/2006 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. by assigning cogent reasons to all the grounds raised by him in his representation. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
37	Santosh Kumar Rathore,	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the

Mahendra Singh

	Asstt. Engineer, WRD (WP No. 1761/04)	petitioner is no more surviving at present and no further action is required in this case.
38	Ashok Kumar Goyal, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 2014/05)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner had been relieved for joining the State of Chhattisgarh. No further action is required.
39	Kirti Kumar Chaudhary, Sub-Engineer., WRD (WP No. 3693/07)	In compliance with the directions dated 14/12/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claims for re-allocation to State of M.P. with proper justification. On the recommendation of Administrative Department, the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
40	Satyendra Singh Sikarwar, Asstt. Engineer. WRD (WP No. 4310/06)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner is no more surviving at present and no further action is required in this case.
41	Suresh Kumar Sharma, Sub-Engineer.WRD (2935/05 and W A No. 422/11)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that in this case an appeal has been filed by the State Government against the judgment dated 15/12/2010. No further action is required till decision of the appellate court in the Writ Appeal is received.
42	Ramesh Chandra Soni, Sub-Engineer. (WP No. 3002/05)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner had been allocated to M.P. No further action is required in the matter.
43	Hari Shankar Sharma, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WA No. 647/11)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted all his claims with sufficient justifications. On the recommendation of Administrative Department, the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered for his re-allocation under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by the issuing a detailed speaking order.
44	Anand Kumar Tripathi, Sub-Engineer. WRD, WA No. 446/11)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claims for re-allocation to State of M.P. On the recommendation of Administrative Department, the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the

		grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
45	Nand Kishore Srivastava, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 5384/08)	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted his claims for re-allocation to State of M.P. on various grounds with proper justifications. On the recommendation of Administrative Department the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by the issuing a detailed speaking order.
46	Mirza Kadir Beg, Sub Engineer, (W.P. No. 6731/06)	The Administrative Department of the petitioner informed the Committee that he stands retired on 31/08/2012 and no further action is required.
47	Subhash Chandra Gupta, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 2476/05 and WA No. 398/11)	On the request of Administrative Department the consideration of this case was deferred by the committee as the Judgement dated 13/08/2008 of Double Judges Bench in W.A. No. 783/07 in the matter of R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others has bearing on this case because of allocation of one junior viz. Shri B.C. Jain to M.P. because of data feeding error regarding his seniority.
48	Rajendra Singh Bhadoria, Tracer, WRD (5311/05 and WA No.423/11)	On the request of Administrative Department the consideration of this case was deferred by the committee as the Judgement dated 13/08/2008 of Double Judges Bench in W.A. No. 783/07 in the matter of R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others has a bearing on this case because of allocation of juniors to M.P. in lower pay scale.
49	Vishwanath Bansal, Sub-Engineer. (WP No. 2936/05)	On the request of Administrative Department the consideration of this case was deferred by the committee as the Judgement dated 13/08/2008 of Double Judges Bench in W.A. No. 783/07 in the matter of R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others has a bearing on this case because of allocation of juniors to M.P. in lower pay scale.
50	Arun Kumar Ingole, Sub-Engineer (Civil) WP No. (2400/09)	The Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner had availed the benefit of mutual transfer. The Committee decided that Administrative Department will examine the application of mutual transfer of petitioner and communicate the final decision to him to comply with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.
51	Bhagwan Singh	In compliance with the directions dated 15/11/2011 of

	Chauhan, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 3691/07)	Hon'ble High Court of M.P. the representation of the petitioner was examined by his Administrative Department. They refuted all his claims for re-allocation to State of M.P. with proper justifications. On the recommendation of Administrative Department, the representation of the petitioner was recommended for rejection by the Committee as none of the grounds raised by him in his representation is covered under the existing guidelines of allocation. The petitioner will be communicated about the rejection of his representation by issuing a detailed speaking order.
52	A K Gupta, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 5279/06)	The consideration of this case are deferred by the Committee because Administrative Department did not clarify in their comments the reasons for allocation of two junior Sub-Engineers namely Shri R.P. Srivastava and Shri Narendra Kumar Garg, who were made respondent No.5 & 6.
53	Rakesh Kumar & P N Sharma, Asstt. Engineers (WP No. 837/12)	On the request of the Administrative Department the Committee deferred the consideration of this case and decided that a detailed write up will be sent by them intimating the difficulties involved in the implementation of judgment dated 13/08/2008 in W.A. No. 783/07 – R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others by the WRD Department.
54	Shailendra Kumar Gite, Sub-Engineer. WRD (WP No. 3056/06)	The Committee was informed that the petitioner was allocated in the pay scale of Rs. 6500-10500 which he was not drawing as on 23/09/2000. The petitioner got the aforesaid scale on October, 2003. His name should not have been included in the pay scale group of Rs. 6500-10500 because he was given the pay scale after the publication of TFAL on 06.09.2001. The Committee noted that the petitioner was wrongly allocated to the State of Chhattisgarh in the higher pay scale instead of in the lower pay scale of Rs. 5500-9000 in which he was senior. The Committee, therefore, recommended the re-allocation of the petitioner from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 5500-9000.
55	A S Parihar, Sub Engineer, WRD (WP No. 61/2006)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
56	S K Rai, Sub-Engineer, WRD, (WP No. 62/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him.

		The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
57	Sudhir Kumar Mishra, Sub-Engineer. (WP No. 1980/05)	All the grounds raised by the petitioner have been examined by his Administrative Department and none of them is covered under the guidelines for re-allocation. Hence, they refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation. A detailed speaking order may be issued by Govt. of India.
58	Nitin S. Joshi, Sub-Engineer. PWD (005/006)	The Department of Water Resources informed that the petitioner belongs to PWD. The Committee decided to obtain the comments of the Administrative Department of the petitioner and placed this case before it in its next meeting.
59	Dinesh Chandra Srivastava, Sub-Engineer. WRD, (5210/06) (W.A. No. 547/2010)	The Committee was informed that on 28/08/2009 the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 5210/06 quashed his allocation order for the State of Chhattisgarh. The Writ Appeal filed by State Government against the said judgment has been dismissed on 08/11/2010 by the Double Judges bench of the Court. Committee noted that it is too late to file Review Petition and no further action is needed at this stage.
60	Manoj Kumar Kalosiya, Sub-Engineerm WRD (WP No. 15011/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
61	Ravi Kant Garg, Asstt. Engineer. WRD, (WP No.3419/09)	All the grounds raised by the petitioner have been examined by his Administrative Department and none of them is covered under the guidelines for re-allocation. Hence, they refuted his claim for re-allocation to State of M.P. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to reject his representation. A detailed speaking order may be issued by Govt. of India.
62	H P Malhotra, Sub-Engineer (WP No. 60/06)	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to

Maninder Singh

		accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees in Chhattisgarh and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance.
63	Suresh Chandra Sharma, Sub-Engineer (W.P. No 2471/10 and WA No.220/11)	On the request of the Administrative Department the Committee deferred the consideration of this case and decided that a detailed write up will be sent by them explaining the difficulties involved in the implementation of judgment dated 13/08/2008 in W.A. No. 783/07 – R S Chaurasia versus Union of India and others in WRD.
64	R N S Bhadoria, SADO (W.P. No.1045/06) Agriculture Deptt.	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that the contention of the petitioner that his 12 junior SADOs were allocated to M.P., is not correct. He informed that two junior SADOs namely Shri Babu Lal Thakur and Shri Suresh Babu Sharma were allocated to M.P. due to error in data feeding in their seniority and other ten junior SADOs were allocated to M.P. under special provision of allocation under the guidelines. The Committee decided to recommend the rejection of representation of petitioner and re-allocate the services of two junior SADOs, who were allocated to M.P. due to error in their seniority, to the State of Chhattisgarh.
65	Kirti Kumar Jain, RAEO (W.P. No. 3693/07)	The consideration of this case was deferred for want of complete details from Administrative Department.
66	C S Tomar, SADO (W.P. No. 1043/06)	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that the contention of the petitioner that his 12 junior SADOs were allocated to M.P., is not correct. He informed that two junior SADOs were allocated to M.P. due to data feeding error in their seniority and other ten junior SADOs were allocated to M.P. under special provision of allocation under the guidelines. The Committee decided to recommend the rejection of representation of petitioner and re-allocate the services of two junior SADOs, who were allocated to M.P. due to error in their seniority, to the State of Chhattisgarh
67	Mukesh Kumar Sharma, Steno Gr. III (W.P. No. 1941/06)	The consideration of these cases was deferred for want of complete details from Administrative Department.
68	Suresh Chandra Chaudhary, Steno G-III (W.P. No. 1153/06)	
69	R S Tomar, RAEO (W.P. No. 2136/06)	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that appeals are going to be filed in the Double Judges Bench against the judgment dated 15/12/2010 of the Single Judge Bench. Hence, no further action is called for at this stage.
70	R S Bais RAEO (W.P. No. 1383/06)	
71	Harendra Pal Singh RAEO	

(87)

	(W.P. No. 1087/07)	
72	Mahesh Prasad Sharma (WA 705/08)	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that the petitioner stands retired on 31/12/2011. No further action is required in the matter.
73	L S Rajput, SADO (W.P. No. 2708/06)	The Committee directed that Administrative Department would obtain the judgment of the Court and examine the case in the light of directions of the Court and facts given by the petitioner in his representation and submit a report to the Committee in its next meeting.
74	Rewa Ram Yadav SADO (W.P. No. 1508/06)	
75	Ram Lal Kushwaha, SADO (W.P. No. 1165/06)	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that they are in the process of collecting a copy of the judgment, W.P. and representation for examination. The Committee deferred the consideration of this case for the next meeting.
76	Sudhakar Harne, SADO (W.P. No. 1048/06)	The representative of Administrative Department informed to the Committee that the petitioner stands retired on 31/08/2011. No further action is required in the matter.
77	S K Soni RAEO (7706/06)	On 05/05/2006 the Hon'ble High Court of M.P. allowed the W.P. and quashed the allocation order dated 11/09/2002 of the petitioner to the State of Chhattisgarh. The Administrative Department of the petitioner has examined the representation of the petitioner in pursuance of Hon'ble High Court' directions and recommended for re-allocation of his services from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. on the ground that 51 junior RAEOs were allocated to M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 4500-7000 in the same category. The Committee accepted the recommendation of the State Government and decided to re-allocate the services of the petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. State on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. under similar conditions in which the allocation of the petitioner took place.
78	Mahesh Prasad Shukla, SADO (W.A. 705/08)	The Administrative Department of the petitioner has examined the representation of the petitioner in pursuance of Hon'ble High Court' directions and recommended for re-allocation of his services from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. on the ground that 58 junior RAEOs were allocated to M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 4500-7000 in the same category. The Committee accepted the recommendation of the State Government and decided to re-allocate the services of the petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. State on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. under similar conditions in which the allocation of the petitioner took place.
79	P D Rai, RAEO (11127/05)	On 01/02/12 the Hon'ble High Court of M.P. allowed the W.P. and quashed the allocation order dated 11/09/2002 of the

		petitioner to the State of Chhattisgarh. The Administrative Department of the petitioner has examined the representation of the petitioner in pursuance of Hon'ble High Court' directions and recommended for re-allocation of his services from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. on the ground that 29 junior RAEOs were allocated to M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 4500-7000 in the same category. The Committee accepted the recommendation of the State Government and decided to re-allocate the services of the petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. State on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. under similar conditions in which the allocation of the petitioner took place.
80	B N Srivastava, RAEO (11184/05)	On 22/02/2012 the Hon'ble High Court of M.P. allowed the W.P. and quashed the allocation order dated 11/09/2002 of the petitioner to the State of Chhattisgarh. The Administrative Department of the petitioner has examined the representation of the petitioner in pursuance of Hon'ble High Court' directions and recommended for re-allocation of his services from the State of Chhattisgarh to the State of M.P. on the ground that 29 junior RAEOs were allocated to M.P. in the pay scale of Rs. 4500-7000 in the same category. The Committee accepted the recommendation of the State Government and decided to re-allocate the services of the petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. State on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. under similar conditions in which the allocation of the petitioner took place.
81	D P Napit, RAEO (W.P. No. 9292/05)	The representative of Administrative Department informed the Committee that they are in the process of collecting a copy of the judgment, W.P. and representation for examination. The Committee deferred the consideration of this case till the next meeting.
82	Mohan Sharan Khare, SADO , D/o Agriculture (W.A. No. 225/12)	The representative of Administrative Department informed that the representation of the petitioner and Writ Petition are not available. The Committee decided that the Administrative Department would obtain representation and Writ Petition etc and furnish their comments in its next meeting.
83	Narendra Kumar Visbaiya, Asstt. G-II, D/o Transport. (WP No. 8358/2006)	The Committee decided to recommend his re-allocation from Chhattisgarh to M.P. as he belongs to SC category and his request is covered under the guidelines of allocation for SC/ST employees.
84	Ashok Kumar Bule, Asstt. Grade II, D/o Commercial Tax (WP No. 3098/2006)	On the recommendation of Administrative Department the Committee recommended the re-allocation of petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. state under spouse policy as his wife is working as Assistant Teacher since 07/12/2008 in State Government School at Indore.

85	Trilok Chand Gupta , Panchayat and Social Education Organiser, D/o Social Welfare (W.P. No. 769/2005)	Consideration of this case was deferred for want of comments of administrative Department and committee decided that GAD would obtain the comments and place this case before it in its next meeting.
86	Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Sub-Engineer (Civil), PHE (2257/2005)	The representatives of the Administrative Department informed the Committee that they have filed a Writ Appeal against judgment dated 15/12/2010 of Hon'ble High Court. No action is necessary till the decision of Appellate Court in the Writ Appeal filed by the State Government is available.
87	Ashok Kumar Tomar, Sub-Engineer, PHE (3423/2005)	The Committee was informed that on 12/03/2008 the Hon'ble High Court quashed the order of allocation of the petitioner of the State of Chhattisgarh on the ground that Central Government did not take into account the fact that wife of the petitioner had been suffering from breast cancer and was getting treatment from cancer hospital and Research Institute, while rejecting his application in 2005 on the recommendation of the Committee. No appeal was filed against the said judgment by the Central Government as well as State Government. The Committee decided to accept the judgment dated 12/03/2008 of the Hon'ble High Court for quashing the allocation order of the petitioner.
88	C. L. Koshta, Sub-Engineer, PHE (4918/2005)	The Committee deferred the consideration of this case and decided that petitioner should obtain a fresh certificate from district medical board prescribing the disease and its intensity .
89	P.N. Parmar, Sub-Engineer, PHE (1724/2005)	On the recommendation of Administrative Department the Committee decided to recommend the representation of the petitioner for rejection as none of the grounds raised by him is covered under the existing guidelines.
90	Bahadur Singh, Steno, GAD (W.P. No. 2640/2012)	On the recommendation of Administrative Department the Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of the petitioner from Chhattisgarh to M.P. as per his entitlement on the basis of the seniority granted to him since 1993.
91	Pramod Kumar Dubey, Medical Officer (WP No. 2398/2007)	The Department of Public Health and Family Welfare failed to furnish their comments on the representation of the petitioners despite specifically directing them in the last meeting. Accordingly, the consideration of these cases was deferred by the Committee. It was also decided to obtain the comments of the Administrative Department well in advance for consideration in the next meeting of the Committee.
92	D.L. Rathore, Medical Specialist (WP No.451/2011)	
93	Krishna Kumar Bhargava, Child Specialist, PH&FW (WP No. 1086/2005)	
94	R.P. Srivastava, Medical Specialist,	

	PH&FW (WP No. 4369/2007)	
95	Ashok Kumar Dixit, Chief Medical & Health Officer, PH&FW (WP No. 4996/2006)	
96	Ramesh Kumar Nema, Medical Specialist, PH&FW (1836/2007)	
97	Shyam Sunder Mahajan, RAEO, (2985/2006)	The Administrative Department examined the representation of the petitioner in the light of the judgment dated of the Hon'ble High Court and informed that acceptance of the request of the petitioner on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. will give rise the opening of cases of 34 RAEOs who are senior and were allocated to Chhattisgarh. Keeping in view the above fact, the Committee recommended to reject the representation.
98	Santosh Kumar Parmar, RAEO, D/o Agriculture W.P. No. 2974/2006)	The Administrative Department examined the representation of the petitioner in the light of the judgment dated of the Hon'ble High Court and informed that acceptance of the request of the petitioner on the ground that his juniors were allocated to M.P. will give rise the opening of cases of 38 RAEOs who are senior and were allocated to Chhattisgarh. Keeping in view the above fact the Committee recommended to reject the representation.
99	Vijay Kumar Mohase, Asstt. Engineer, WRD	The main contention of the petitioner is that as he belongs to SC and domicile of MP, he should be allocated to MP. The Administrative Department has refuted claim of the petitioner for re-allocation his services to State of M.P. by assigning sufficient reasons to all the other grounds raised by him. The consideration of this case was deferred as the issue relating to accrual of benefits by the dependents of the SC/ST employees is challenging and who are domicile of MP needs to be sorted out in the first instance as explained at Sl.No.3.
100	Gya Deen Kori, Sub-Engineer, WRD	
101	Prakash Chandra Sankala, Sub-Engineer, WRD	
102	Murari Lal Shakya, RAEO, Agriculture	The Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of both the employees belonging to SC from Chhattisgarh to M.P. as their request is covered by the guidelines of allocation for SC/ST employees.
103	Sewa Ram Khede, RAEO, Agriculture	
104	R.D. Shakya, Compounder, PH&FW	The Committee again deferred the consideration of this case because Administrative Department of the applicant did not furnish facts regarding his caste and domicile. The said information in respect of the employee may be ascertained from the Madhya Pradesh/Chhattisgarh Government on the basis of entries in his service book. This item will be considered in the next meeting.

105	C.L. Soneshwar, RHEO, Horticulture	The Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of both the employees belonging to SC from Chhattisgarh to M.P. as their request is covered by the guidelines of allocation for SC/ST employees.
106	Santosh Kumar Bhagel, RHEO, Horticulture	
107	R. K Gaharwar, Asstt. Dir. D/O Commerce & Industry	The Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of both the employees belonging to SC from Chhattisgarh to M.P. as their request is covered by the guidelines of allocation for SC/ST employees.
108	K R. Kaneria, Asstt. Dir. , D/O Commerce & Industry	
109	Girish Bahadur Thapa, Asstt. Grade II , Panchayat & Social Welfare	The Committee decided to recommend the re-allocation of Shri Thapa from Chhattisgarh to M.P. State on the ground that he suffered on account of Bhopal Gas Tragedy and received a compensation of Rs 50000.
110	Shiv Kumar Srivastava, Surveyor, D/o Agriculture	The consideration of this case was deferred by the Committee for want of comments of Administrative Department. It will be placed before the Committee in its next meeting.
111	Sant Pal Singh Bhadoria, Constable, D/o Home, (W.P. No. 2312/05)	The Administrative Department informed that the petitioner has already been allocated to M.P. under mutual transfer policy and his grievances have already been redressed. No further action is required in the matter.
112	Ajay Singh Bais, Sub-Inspector, D/o Home (W.P. No. 5739/06)	The Administrative Department of the petitioner informed that the contention of the petitioner that his juniors were allocated to M.P. is not correct because the said juniors were allocated to M.P. falls under other category of allocation. The other grounds given by the petitioner for re-allocating his services to M.P. do not entitle him for allocation to M.P. Therefore, the Committee decided to recommend to reject the representation of the petitioner.

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

Mahendra Singh

*****