

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

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Ram Singh

-----Vice Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Mr. Rajeev Gupta

-----Vice Chairman (A)

CLAIM PETITION NO. 30/DB/2019

Shailendra Singh Bisht, S/o Dr. Surendra Singh Bisht, Project Director, Presently posted as Chief Development Officer, District Champawat, under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.

.....**Petitioner**

VERSUS

1. Chief Secretary, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
2. State of Uttarakhand through Principal Secretary/Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttarakhand, Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun.
3. Departmental Promotion Committee dated 25.09.2013, Department of Rural Development, through Secretary Rural Development, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
4. Shri Vinod Fonia, S/o Shri Kedar Singh Fonia, the then Secretary, Rural Development Govt. of Uttarakhand, currently Nehru Colony, near Dharampur, Dehradun.
5. Sri Arun Kumar Rajpoot, Deputy Commissioner (Programme), Gramya Vikas Nideshalaya, Kandolia, Pauri Garhwal.
6. Sri Ganesh Singh Khati, Deputy Commissioner (Administration), Gramya Vikas Nideshalaya, Kandolia, Pauri Garhwal.
7. Commissioner, Department of Rural Development, Uttarakhand, Pauri.

.....**Respondents**

Present: Sri M.C.Pant & Sri L.K.Maithani, Ld. Counsels for the petitioner.

Sri V.P.Devrani, Ld. A.P.O. for the Respondent No. 1, 2, 3 & 7

Sri Bhagwat Mehra, Ld. Counsel for the Respondents No. 5& 6

And

CLAIM PETITION NO. 55/DB/2019

1. Bharat Chandra Bhatt, S/o Shri K.D. Bhatt, aged about 50 years, R/o presently posted as Project Director, District Tehri Garhwal under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.
2. Sardar Singh Chauhan, S/o Late Shri Mohar Singh aged about 59 years, R/o Presently posted as Additional Chief Executive Officer, U.S.R.L.M, Ajiwika Bhawan, Tapovan Road, Raipur, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.
3. Prakash Singh Rawat, S/o Shri K.S.Rawat, aged about 50 years, R/o presently posted as Project Director, District Chamoli, under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.
4. Ramesh Chandra Tiwari, S/o Late Shri Dala Dutt Tiwari, aged about 50 years, R/o Presently posted as Project Director, District Haridwar under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.
5. Balikrishna Tamta, S/o Late Sri Bachi Ram, aged about 59 years, R/o Presently posted as Project Director, District Nainital under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.
6. Naresh Kumar, S/o Shri Tila Ram aged about 50 years, R/o presently posted as Project Director, District Almora under the Rural Development Department, Uttarakhand.

.....**Petitioners**

VERSUS

1. Chief Secretary, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
2. State of Uttarakhand through Principal Secretary/Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttarakhand, Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun.
3. Departmental Promotion Committee dated 25.09.2013, Department of Rural Development, through Secretary Rural Development, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
4. Sri Arun Kumar Rajpoot, Deputy Commissioner (Programme), Gramya Vikas Nideshalaya, Kandolia, Pauri Garhwal.
5. Sri Ganesh Singh Khati, Deputy Commissioner (Administration), Gramya Vikas Nideshalaya, Kandolia, Pauri Garhwal.
6. Commissioner, Department of Rural Development, Uttarakhand, Pauri.

.....**Respondents**

Present: Sri M.C.Pant & Sri L.K.Maithani, Ld. Counsels for the petitioners.
 Sri V.P.Devrani, Ld. A.P.O. for the respondent No. 1, 2, 3 & 6
 Sri Bhagwat Mehra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 4 & 5

JUDGMENT**DATED: DECEMBER 23, 2019****HON'BLE MR. RAM SINGH, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)**

1. The petitioner in claim petition No. 30/DB/2019, has sought the following reliefs:-

“i) To quash the illegal and malafide recommendations of DPC dated 25.10.2013 by which in contravention of Rules 1991 as amended in 2005 and Rules 2011 the name of the respondents No. 5 & 6 were recommended for the promotion to the post earmarked for PDS cadre by law.

ii) To quash the promotion order dated 11.08.2015 of the respondent No. 5 & 6 to the post of Deputy Commissioner and impugned order dated 02.01.2017, by which the grade pay Rs. 8700 were granted to the respondents No. 5 & 6.

iii) To quash order No. 1605 dated 03.10.2013 issued by respondent No. 1 being wholly in utter contravention of the Rules 2011, usurping the posts earmarked by law to the Provincial Development Service cadre members hence, arbitrary and illegal.

iv) To issue an order or direction to the respondents No. 1 and 2 to consider to promote eligible members of Provincial Development Service cadre including the petitioner in the vacant 6 posts of CDO and Deputy Commissioner since 11.08.2015 earmarked for PDS member as per prevalent Rules 2011.

v) To issue any other order or direction which this court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case in favour of the petition.

vi) To award the cost of petition.”

2. The petitioners in claim petition No. 55/DB/2019 have sought the following reliefs:

“i) To quash the illegal and malafide recommendations of DPC dated 25.10.2013 by which in contravention of Rules 1991 as

amended in 2005 and Rules 2011 the name of the respondents No. 4 & 5 were recommended for the promotion to the post earmarked for PDS cadre by law.

ii) To quash the promotion order dated 11.08.2015 of the respondent No. 4 & 5 to the post of Deputy Commissioner and impugned order dated 02.01.2017, by which the grade pay Rs. 8700 were granted to the respondents No. 4 & 5.

iii) To quash order No. 1605 dated 03.10.2013 issued by respondent No. 1 being wholly in utter contravention of the Rules 2011, usurping the posts earmarked by law to the Provincial Development Service cadre members hence, arbitrary and illegal.

iv) To issue an order or direction to the respondents No. 1 and 2 to consider to promote eligible members of Provincial Development Service cadre including the petitioner in the vacant 6 posts of CDO and Deputy Commissioner since 11.08.2015 earmarked for PDS member as per prevalent Rules 2011.

v) To issue an order and direction to the respondent No. 2 to grant grade pay 8700 to the PDS cadre members on completion of 13 years of service grade pay 8700 being the provision of their own service cadre rules i.e. Uttarakhand Provincial Development Service Rules, 2011 in the same manner as respondent No. 2 has awarded grade pay 8700 to respondents No. 4 & 5 i.e. members of Training cadre on the basis of service rules of different cadre i.e. PDS cadre service Rules 2011 despite their not being members of PDS cadre.

vi) To issue any other order or direction which this court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case in favour of the petitioner.

vii) To award the cost of the petition."

3. As both the cases relate to the same issue and involving the common question of law, hence, they are being decided jointly, taking the claim petition No. 30/DB/2019 as leading case.

4. Briefly stated, the petitioners of both the petitions and private respondents No. 5 & 6 of petition No. 30/DB/2019 and private respondents No. 4 & 5 in claim petition No. 55/DB/2019, all were earlier governed by the U.P. Rural Development Department Gazetted Officers Service Rules, 1991(hereinafter referred to as '1991 Rules'). The Development Officer service comprises of two wings, one is Provincial Development Service branch (BDO cadre) to which petitioners belong and other branch is of Training cadre, consisting of Extension Training Officers and the posts of the Principals (Group-I) to which private respondents belong.

5. In the 1991 Rules, following posts were covered:

- i. Block Development Officer,
- ii. District Development Officer
- iii. Deputy Development Commissioner, and
- iv. Additional Commissioner, Rural Development.

The source of recruitment under the 1991 rules for the post of Block Development Officer was 50% by direct recruitment and 50% by promotion from Joint Block Development Officers and next promotional post for BDOs was of District Development Officer (100% by promotion) whereas, 3rd cadre post was Deputy Development Commissioner, to be filled up 75% by promotion from amongst substantively appointed District Development Officers and 25% posts of Deputy Development Commissioner were to be filled up by promotion from amongst substantively appointed Principals (Group-I) of Extension Training Centre, who have completed 5 years of service and thereafter, 4th stage promotional post was of Additional Commissioner, Rural Development, to be filled up 100% by promotion from the post of Deputy Development Commissioner.

6. For the posts in Training cadre, separate rules were also promulgated in the year 1992, known as 'the U.P. Rural Development (Extension Training) Gazetted Officers Service Rules, 1992 (hereinafter

referred to as the '1992 Rules') and as per Rule 5 of the said Rules, the cadre comprises various posts of Extension Training Officers in different fields i.e. Panchayat, Agriculture Engineering, Animal Husbandry, Soil Science, Public Health, Cooperative and Industries Service Business, Women Welfare and Accounts etc, posts of District Training Officers, and their promotional post of Assistant Commissioner (Training) and Principal Group-A.

7. The post of Assistant Commissioner (Training) and Principal Group-A is be filled up by promotion through a Selection Committee from amongst District Training Officers and Extension Training Officers, who have completed 5 years of service, on the first day of the recruitment year. Such Rules of 1992 provided only upto the post of Assistant Commissioner (Training) and Principals Group-A and thereafter, such Principals Group-A were given 25% quota in the '1991 Rules' for promotion as Deputy Development Commissioner, who could get further promotion as Additional Commissioner in 1991 Rules. The pleadings submitted by both the parties before the court also clarify that after bifurcation of the State, these rules were made applicable in Uttarakhand too and in 2004 and 2005 restructuring of the cadre of the Provincial Development Service cadre (Block Development cadre) and Training cadre was also made.

8. Rules of 1991 remained in force till 2011, when such rules were replaced by the State of Uttarakhand, with 'the Uttarkhand Provincial Development Service Rules, 2011' vide Notification dated 27.05.2011 and superseded all existing rules and orders on the subject. By such Rules of 2011, 25% promotion quota of the Principal of the Training Branch was abolished and only the officers of the Provincial Development Cadre i.e. Block Development Cadre were made eligible to be promoted upto the level of Deputy Commissioner and then Additional Commissioner, Rural Development and the posts of Chief Development

Officer, Joint Secretary, Deputy Commissioner were created and placed in the same level.

9. The record reveals that the private respondents Ganesh Singh Khati and others belonging to the Training Branch filed a WP SB No. 152 of 2012 in the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand in the name of Dr. Ganesh Singh Khati Vs. State of Uttarakhand & others and claimed that as the petitioners before the court, who were governed by the 1991 rules as applicable in the Uttarakhand are protected by virtue of the provisions of Section 74 contained in U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000, they were eligible for promotion to the post of Deputy Development Officer from their 25% quota of Principal Group-A, Extension Training Centre as per Rules of 1991. Petitioners of that writ petition (private respondents in this case) approached the Hon'ble High Court with the contention that they completed 5 years of service as Principal Group-A Extension Training Centre on 05.06.2010 and became eligible for being considered for promotion to the post of Deputy Development Commissioner within their quota of 25 %, specifically reserved by the rules of 1991, hence, in view of the Reorganization Act, 2000, their service conditions cannot be altered to their disadvantage by the new rules of 2011, which can be made effective only prospectively. The private respondents approached the Hon'ble High Court for a direction to the government to consider them for promotion on the post of Deputy Development Commissioner (later on termed as Deputy Commissioner), in view of the fact they were eligible and posts were vacant, before the enforcement of the rules of 2011.

10. The said petition was heard and allowed by the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 07.05.2013 and found that as the petitioners (private respondents in this petition) acquired eligibility before coming into force of new rules of 2011 and a right to be considered for being promoted to the post of Deputy Commissioner and such post was available under the old Rules of 1991 for Principals Group-

A Extension Training Centre, and the said post was later on renamed as Deputy Commissioner, it was held to be still available for Principal Group-A Extension Training Centre. Accordingly, a direction was given to the State Government to consider their claim by supplying such post by promotion for eligible Principals (Group-A) Extension Training Centre, in terms of old Rules of 1991 as quickly as possible and not later than four months from the date of service of copy of the order of the court.

11. The order of the Hon'ble Court passed on 07.05.2013, was never challenged before any other competent authority and the State Govt. in compliance of said order, after considering the vacancies, held a meeting of Departmental Selection Committee on 25.10.2013 (Annexure A2) and in furtherance of that, vide order dated 11.08.2015 (Annexure: A3), Ganesh Singh Khati and Arun Kumar Rajput, Principals of Extension Training Cadre, were promoted on the post of Deputy Commissioner in the grade pay of Rs. 7600. The record also reveals that such grade pay of Rs. 7600 was later on revised to the grade pay of Rs. 8700 to remove the pay anomaly vide order dated 02.01.2017 (Annexure: A4).

12. The petitioners belonging to Block Development Officer Cadre, although never challenged the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court before any forum, have now approached to this Tribunal broadly on two points. Firstly, that such facts were concealed from the Hon'ble High Court that in the year 1992, separate rules for the cadre of Extension Training branch were promulgated, superseding all such rules and according to the petitioners, the private respondents, after promulgation of the 1992 rules were having no right to claim any benefit under the 1991 rules as their cadre was totally separate. In such circumstances, the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court was got by concealing the facts by the state respondent and other persons. Moreover, the petitioners were not parties to that petition. Hence, according to the petitioners, after promulgation of the 1992 rules, private respondents lost their right to be

considered for promotion on the post of Deputy Commissioner in the 1991 Rules.

13. It has also been contended that by restructuring of the department, vide order dated 16.06.2004 (Annexure: 12), Reorganization of Training cadre was made and for them a post of Deputy Commissioner (Training & Management) was separately created in Uttarakhand. While in the cadre of Development branch (Block Development Officer cadre) vide Notification dated 24.06.2005 (Annexure:A13), two posts of Deputy Commissioner/Deputy Development Commissioner were created along with some other posts, hence, both the cadres were reorganized and the state respondents in gross violation of the rules and misrepresentation of the order of the Hon'ble High Court, wrongly promoted the private respondents.

14. The second point raised by the petitioners is that the promotional posts for the cadre of Development Branch (BDO cadre) were wrongly supplied to the cadre of Training Branch. When a separate post of Deputy Commissioner (Training) was created for private respondents, officers of Training Branch cannot be promoted on the sanctioned posts for the Development Branch. The petitioners have also based their petition on the ground that by making a wrong calculation of the posts, private respondents have been promoted. Hence, both the petitions have been filed by the petitioners for the reliefs mentioned above, on above grounds and petitioners have requested to quash the recommendations of the DPC, the promotion order of the private respondents, and to quash the order No. 1605 dated 03.10.2013 issued by the respondent No. 1 for usurping the posts for Provincial Development Service cadre members, and also sought a direction for the respondents No. 1 & 2 to consider and promote eligible members of the Provincial service cadre including the petitioners, on the vacant posts of Chief Development Officer/ Deputy Commissioner and to issue any other order which the court may deem fit and proper. A direction has

also been sought for respondent No. 2 to grant the grade pay of Rs. 8700 to the Provincial Development Service cadre members on completion of the required number of service in the same manner, respondent No. 2 has awarded the Grade Pay of Rs. 8700 to the private respondents i.e. the members of the Training cadre.

15. These petitions have been opposed by the state respondents as well as private respondents on the ground that by way of such petitions, the petitioners are virtually filing the appeal against the order of the Hon'ble High Court passed on 07.05.2013 in Writ Petition No. 152(S/B) of 2012. The state respondents have contended that in compliance of the Hon'ble High Court order, the DPC was held, calculation of the posts available before promulgation of the new rules of 2011, rightly was made as per law, and out of that 25 % vacancies were made available for the persons of Training cadre and after making right calculation of nine posts of Deputy Commissioner, the promotions on 25 % posts (two posts) were rightly made.

16. It is also contended that the petitioners have come up before the court with the wrong contention that the promotion quota for the Principal Group-A in Training cadre was abolished by promulgation of the 1992 rules. According to the respondents, for the Extension Training Officers, District Training Officers and Assistant Commissioner (Training)/ Principal Group A, there were no such rules before 1992. Such posts might have been created by Executive Orders and after 1992 rules, the posts of Extension Training Officer, District Training Officer and Assistant Commissioner (Training) and Principal Group-A were to be covered by such Rules of 1992. There was no such amendment in the 1991 rules to take away 25 % promotional quota of the Principal Group A to the post of Deputy Commissioner. It is also contended that the 1992 Rules were made to cover a different field, only up to the post of Principal Group A, which was not provided in the 1991 rules, and above the post of Principal, they were entitled to get their promotion as Deputy

Commissioner in the '1991 Rules' and thereafter on the post of Additional Commissioner. Such arrangement was continued till the new rules of 2011 were promulgated in the new State of Uttarakhand, and applying and considering the said legal position, Hon'ble High Court had finally decided the issue. The private respondents were eligible to be considered for promotion on the post of Deputy Commissioner, and as the posts were vacant before promulgation of the 2011 rules hence, their right was decided by the Hon'ble Court and promotion was provided to them by the State after adopting the due process. Respondents have contended that the rules of 2011 have prospective operation and promotion order of the private respondents cannot be set aside on the basis of the objections raised by the petitioners. The respondents have also contended that the calculation of the posts of the Deputy Commissioner as available on or before the date of application of 2011 rules, particularly in the year 2010 were made when the private respondents were eligible to be considered for promotion. Petitioners are not entitled for any relief and the petition deserves to be dismissed.

17. We have heard both the sides and perused the record.

18. The petitioners based their claim on two points. It is their contention that after promulgation of 1992 rules, the officers of the Training Branch i.e. the cadre of private respondents, became separate. As they were governed by the separate rules of 1992 hence, they cannot get any benefit under the '1991 Rules' as the preamble of the 1992 rules specifically provides for supersession of all the rules in this respect. This contention has been opposed by the respondents on the ground that supersession can be made only to such field to which the Rules of 1992 govern the field.

19. After hearing both the parties, we conclude that under the 1992 rules, the cadre posts of District Training Officer and Extension Training Officer, and their promotional post of Assistant Commissioner (Training) and Principal (Group A) were only covered. Such posts were

nowhere mentioned in the 1991 rules, made earlier. Such posts may have been created by Executive orders and to cover such Executive Orders, 1992 Rules were made. 1991 Rules nowhere, mention how the Principal Group-A and Assistant Commissioner (Training) and other officers of Extension Training Centre would be recruited. We find that the field of 1992 Rules is totally different from the field of 1991 Rules and the scheme of both the Rules makes it clear that under 1992 Rules, the cadre of Extension Training Officer, District Training Officer and upto the Promotional post of Assistant Commissioner (Training)/ Principal Group A is only covered and thereafter, officers of the level of Assistant Commissioner/Principal Group-A of Training Branch had their 25 % promotion quota to the post of Deputy Development Commissioner (later on termed as Deputy Commissioner) mentioned in 1991 rules. Hence, even if, the preamble of Rules of 1992 is taken into cognizance, it does not replace their right under 1991 Rules. It makes no difference whether such fact was placed or not before the Hon'ble High Court while deciding the writ petition No. 152 (SB) of 2012. It cannot be said that the order of the Hon'ble High Court was got by concealment of facts. We find that when 1992 Rules were promulgated, there was no such amendment made in 1991 Rules to take away their 25% quota of promotion for the post of Deputy Commissioner. We hold that upto the post of Principal Group-A, the persons of Training branch were governed by 1992 Rules, and thereafter, they were eligible, and remained eligible to be promoted to the post of Deputy Development Commissioner (later on termed as Deputy Commissioner) to the extent of 25% till promulgation of new rules of 2011, made in Uttarakhand.

20. The petitioners have referred to the different amendments in Uttar Pradesh in the year 2005 or some later years. We hold that on 09.11.2000 when the bifurcation of the State took place and the then existing law in the State of U.P. was made applicable to Uttarakhand, any amendment made thereafter in the State of U.P., is not applicable in the State of Uttarakhand. For Uttarakhand, the rule position of 1991 Rules

remains the same and the promotion quota for the Principal Group-A to the extent of 25 %, on the post of Deputy Commissioner was available till the date on which the new Rules of 2011 were made in Uttarakhand, and the private respondents got eligibility for their promotion prior to it. Accordingly after considering their claim, they were allowed such facility by the order of the Hon'ble High Court. Hence, now on the basis of the plea of separate rules of 1992 raised by the petitioners, the claim of the petitioners cannot be allowed to sustain. We find no force in their arguments now. Even if the 1992 rules were passed, we hold that private respondents' right to be considered for promotion on 25% quota on the post of Deputy Commissioner was very much there in 1991 Rules till the year 2011.

21. The second point raised by the petitioner is that a wrong calculation of the posts of the cadre of Deputy Commissioner was made by the State respondent. The petitioners have contended that two posts were transferred at the time of bifurcation from the State of U.P., thereafter, at the time of Reorganization of the cadre, two further posts of Deputy Commissioner was created for the cadre of Development Branch and one post of Deputy Commissioner (Training) was created for the cadre of Training branch. The created post of Deputy Commissioner or equivalent post Chief Development Officer cannot be deemed to be created for giving 25% quota to the persons of Training Branch and a wrong calculation has been made accordingly.

22. It has been contended on behalf of the respondents that till the promulgation of new rules of 2011, if any such post of Deputy Commissioner/Chief Development Officer/Joint Secretary etc. by whatsoever, name it, was created, it will be deemed to be created in the 1991 rules and even after reorganization of the structure of the department, posts can only be filled up under some rules. Respondents have also argued that a correct calculation was made by the department vide letter No. 572/XI/10/53(30) 2004 dated 03.05.2010 (Annexure CA-

1), whereby after reorganization of the department, 8 posts of the level of Deputy Commissioner, obviously including the posts of CDO and one of Joint Secretary, of the Grade pay of Rs. 8700, and for further promotion, one higher post of Additional Commissioner of the grade pay of Rs. 8900 were created.

23. The petitioners have contended that the officers and Principals of the Extension Training cadre were not entitled to be promoted to the post of CDO and the posts of CDO were wrongly calculated for the Training Cadre. Whereas, respondents have argued that the posts of Deputy Commissioner and CDOs were one and the same rank in the State and on 03.5.2010, State was having total 8 posts before promulgation of the of the new rules of 2011. Hence, when the DPC meeting was convened in the year 2013 for the post of Deputy Commissioner, all those available 8 posts of Deputy Commissioner level would be considered for promotion to all the eligible persons.

24. We agree with the arguments of the respondents and hold that before enforcement of the 2011 Rules, if any number of posts of Deputy Commissioner were created and available, they were available only under the 1991 Rules to which private respondents were also entitled to 25 % quota and accordingly the calculation made by the State respondents was correct and 25% quota of two posts for promotion of private respondents was correctly made, in compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court. The contention of the petitioners that after reorganization of the cadre, a separate post of Deputy Commissioner (Training) was created for the training branch officers hence, they cannot get promotion on the post of Development branch, has no meaning because of the reason that even if the said post was created for a short time, it would be considered to be created under 1991 Rules. Hence, the post of Deputy Commissioner (Development or Training) whatever names it maybe, can only be deemed to be created and filled up according to the 1991 Rules. Hence, even if the post of Deputy

Commissioner (Training Management) was created, such post shall be deemed to have been created under the 1991 Rules and all such posts of Deputy Commissioner counted together, will be supplied in the ratio of 75% and 25% to the officers of the Development branch and Extension Training branch respectively.

25. We find no force in the statement of the petitioners that the posts of their quota were wrongly supplied to the private respondents by promoting them in compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court. The DPC took all the posts of Deputy Commissioners into consideration for promotion and recommended the promotion of private respondents as per their quota mentioned in the 1991 Rules.

26. Having considered all the contention raised by the petitioners, we find no force in both the petitions and the relief claimed therein. The petitioners are not entitled to any relief. They are virtually asking to this court, to undo the whole exercise done by the State respondents in compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court, passed in writ petition SB 152 of 2012. The petition deserves to be dismissed.

ORDER

Both the claim petitions are hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

Let a copy of this judgment be placed on the file of Claim Petition No. 55/DB/2019.

(RAJEEV GUPTA)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

(RAM SINGH)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

DATED: DECEMBER, 23 2019
DEHRADUN.
KNP