

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL  
UTTARAKHAND, DEHRADUN**

Present: Sri V.K. Maheshwari

----- Vice Chairman (J)

&

Sri D.K.KOTIA

----- Vice Chairman (A)

**CLAIM PETITION NO. 25/T/2006**

Jagmer Singh (Dead) through legal heirs:

- (1) Smt. Rajbala Devi, W/o Late Sri Jagmer Singh, R/o Surya Nagar, Lane No. 2, Sinoli Road, Baraut, District Bagpat, U.P,
- (2) Varun Kumar S/o Late Sri Jagmer Singh, R/o Surya Nagar, Lane No. 2, Sinoli Road, Baraut, District Bagpat, U.P,
- (3) Smt. Priya W/o Pankaj, D/o Jagmer Singh,

.....Petitioners

**VERSUS**

1. State of U.P. through Secretary Home Department, U.P. Civil Secretariat, Lucknow,
2. Inspector General of Police, Meerut Zone, Meerut,
3. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Garhwal Range, Pauri, Garhwal, U.P. (at present State of Uttarakhand)
4. Superintendent of Police, Chamoli, U.P. (at present State of Uttarakhand)

.....Respondents

Present: Sri M.C.Pant, Counsel  
for the petitioner

Sri Umesh Dhaundiyal, A.P.O.  
for the respondents

**ORDER****DATE: MARCH 03, 2014**

1. This petition was filed before the U.P. Public Services Tribunal, Lucknow in the year 2000. After the creation of the State of Uttarakhand, the petition was transferred to this Tribunal. The petitioner has challenged the order dated 21.10.1999 passed by Superintendent of Police, Chamoli by which the petitioner has been removed from service from the post of Constable. During the pendency of this petition, the petitioner had died and the petition is prosecuted by his legal representatives.

2. First of all, the Counsel appearing for the respondents have challenged this petition on the ground of maintainability before this Tribunal. We are also of the view that before going to the merits of the petition, it is proper to decide the question of maintainability of this petition before this Tribunal.

3. We have heard both the parties at length and perused the written submissions submitted on behalf of the petitioner.

4. It has been contended on behalf of the respondents that the impugned order was passed before creation of State of Uttarakhand and at that time, the petitioner was in the service of the State of U.P. and not in the service of State of Uttarakhand. The petitioner had never been the employee of the state of Uttarakhand and as per the provisions contained in Section-2(b) of Uttarakhand Public Services Tribunal Act, 1976, only those persons are entitled

to prefer the petition before this Tribunal who are public servants i.e. employee of the State of Uttarakhand. As the petitioner has never been in the service of the State of Uttarakhand, he can not be treated to be public servant as per the provisions mentioned above; therefore he is not entitled to prefer this petition before this Tribunal. On the other hand, it has been contended that the petitioner had preferred this petition before the U.P. State Public Services Tribunal from where it has been transferred to this Tribunal as per the provisions of Section 91 of the U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000. Therefore, this petition is maintainable before this Tribunal.

5. We have carefully considered the rival contentions raised by the parties. In fact, the provisions of Section 91 of the U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000 would have been applicable had the matter related to the State of Uttarakhand been pending before the Public Services Tribunal, Uttar Pradesh, but in our opinion, the matter was not at all related to the State of Uttarakhand as the petitioner had already been dismissed from the service before the creation of the State of Uttarakhand. In case, the petitioner has any grievance regarding his service conditions that are concerned to the State of U.P. only and not to the State of Uttarakhand as the petitioner has never been in the employment of the State of Uttarakhand, therefore, provisions of Section 91 of U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000 are not attracted in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bihar State Electricity Board and another Vs. Ram Deo Prasad

Singh and others, (2011)12 S.C.C., 632, but in our opinion, this principle is not applicable in the present case as no cause of action has ever arisen in the State of Uttarakhand.

6. As regards the contention of the respondents is concerned, it is clear from the record that the petitioner was employee of the State of U.P. and the grievance to the petitioner, if any, is against the State of U.P. only. The petitioner had never been the employee of the State of Uttarakhand and therefore, no cause of action arises to the petitioner against the State of Uttarakhand. The similar principle has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Uttarakhand & another Vs. Umakant Joshi 2012(1) U.D. 583. Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand has also laid down the similar principle in State of Uttarakhand & others Vs. Public Services Tribunal & others in W.P. (S/B) No. 33 of 2007 and it has been held that in case any public servant has never been an employee of the State of Uttarakhand, Uttarakhand Public Services Tribunal does not have any jurisdiction to entertain the petition. As the petitioner had not been the employee of the State of Uttarakhand, therefore, the present petition does not lie before this Tribunal. Moreover, the present petition cannot even be treated as a pending proceeding on the date of coming into force the U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000. Applying the above principles, it becomes clear that this petition is not maintainable before this Tribunal. Thus, the contention of the respondents appears to be reasonable.

7. It has also been contended on behalf of the petitioner that according to provisions of Section 91 of U.P.

Reorganization Act, 2000, the authority vests with the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad for determination of the point of jurisdiction once the petition stands transferred in Uttarakhand, but we do not find any force in the contention as the matter has been settled by the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand and the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

8. The provisions of Section 12 of Uttarakhand Public Services Tribunal Act has also been referred, but these provisions are transitory provisions which were meant for the cases which were pending in another court at the time of enactment of the aforesaid Act and these provisions have no relevance for the present controversy.

9. In the light of the discussion made above, we are of the considered opinion that the petition is not maintainable before this Tribunal for adjudicating the matter in controversy involved in this petition. So, we have no option except to return the petition to the petitioner. At the same time, we also want to make an observation that the petitioner has been pursuing this petition before this Tribunal bonafidely and there is no fault on his part.

10. Let the petition be returned to the petitioner for presentation before the proper court, authority or forum.

*Sd/-*

**D.K.KOTIA**  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

*Sd/-*

**V.K.MAHESHWARI**  
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

DATE: MARCH 03, 2014  
DEHRADUN

KNP