



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3396]

**TUESDAY ,THE TWENTY NINETH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

WRIT PETITION NO: 20376/2024

Between:

1.KILLO HARIDAS, S/O LATE DAMODHAR, AGE 56 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS ASSISTANT CITY PLANNER AT
KAKINADA MUNICIPAL CORPORATION KAKINADA, KAKINADA
DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT (VIG-I) DIRECTORATE ATE SECRETARIAT
BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMRAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2.THE DIRECTOR OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING,
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH MGM CAPITAL, GROUND
FLOOR, NRI HOSPITAL NH FLY OVER, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR
DISTRICT, AMRAVATI.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.S SRINIVASA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR SERVICES IV

The Court made the following:**ORDER:**

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India with the following prayer:

“...to issue any writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus aggrieved by the action of respondent in not considering case of petitioner for promotion to the post of Deputy Director/Deputy City Planner at 2nd respondent Director of Town and Country Planning which is highly illegal ... ”

2. Heard Sri S.Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri.R.S.Manidhar Pingali, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Services.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was appointed as Town Planning Building Overseer in the year 1987 and thereafter he got promotion as Assistant City Planner in the year 2016 and since then he has been working as Assistant City Planner. Learned counsel further would submit that respondents have conducted surprise check on 13.12.2019 and consequently, issued G.O.RT No.684 of Municipal Administration & Urban Development (VIG.I) Department dated 04.09.2024 and framing the charges on the basis allegations of the year of 2019 and the same was issued with intent to delay and obstruct the promotion of the petitioner. Learned counsel further would submit that the petitioner was placed in the order of Seniority for the post of Deputy Director, Town Planning and the 2nd respondent is going to conduct Departmental Promotions.

4. It is contended that because of pendency of the disciplinary proceedings and criminal proceedings, the 2nd respondent is trying to deny the promotion of the petitioner. It is stated that as per G.O.Ms.No.257 dated 10.06.1999, mere pendency of disciplinary proceedings or pendency of criminal case are not a bar for considering the case of the petitioner for promotion. He, therefore, prays for consideration of the case of the petitioner for promotion and direction may be given to the respondents to consider the case of petitioner in the light of G.O.Ms.No.257, dated 10.06.1999.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader would submit that the Court may pass appropriate orders in the light of G.O.Ms.No.257.

6. At this juncture, it is relevant to refer G.O.Ms.No.257 General Administration (Ser.C) Department, dated 10.06. 1999 and it reads thus:

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT

Public Services State and Subordinate Services Appointment by Promotion/Transfer to higher categories of Employees who are facing disciplinary case - Guidelines - Issued.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (SER.C) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Ms.No.257.

Dated 10-06-1999.

Read the following:

1. G.O.Ms.No.424, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dt.25-05-76.

2. G.O.Ms.No.104, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dt.16-02-1990.
3. G.O.Ms.No.66, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dt.30-01-91.
4. From the Dept. of Personnel & Training, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions Govt. of India, Memo.No.22011/ 4/91 -Estt. (A), dt.14-09-1992.
5. G.O.Ms.No.74, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dt.24-02-94.
6. G.O.Ms.No.203, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dt.05-05-99.

ORDER:

In the G.Os 1st to 3rd read above, orders were issued enunciating guidelines for consideration of employees who are facing disciplinary enquiries in regard to their appointment by promotion or transfer to higher categories.

2. In the reference fourth read above, the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Government of India have issued guidelines in regard to consideration of Government servants against whom disciplinary or court proceedings are pending or whose conduct is under investigation, for promotion to next higher categories. Keeping in view the said guidelines, orders have been issued in the G.O. fifth read above, for consideration of employees for ad hoc promotion where the disciplinary case/criminal prosecution against the Govt. employees is not concluded even after the expiry of two years from the date of the meeting of the first Departmental Promotion Committee, in which the employee was considered, in case the employee is not under suspension.

3. It has come to the notice of Government, that the guidelines issued in the said orders are not being strictly adhered to in several departments and ad hoc promotion is being considered on the simple ground, that two years period has elapsed after institution of disciplinary proceedings against the employee without going into the desirability of making ad hoc promotion in such case. The Government have carefully reviewed the issue and accordingly It has been decided to cancel the orders Issued in the G.O. fifth read above and issue suitable guidelines on the subject.

4. Accordingly, orders issued in the G.O.Ms.No.74, General Administration (Ser-C) Department, dated the 24th February, 1994 are hereby cancelled with immediate effect.

5. Government also order that with immediate effect the following procedure and guidelines, be followed to consider the employees against whom disciplinary cases or criminal prosecution are pending or whose conduct is under investigation, for appointment by promotion or transfer, to next higher categories.

A. The details of employees in the zone of consideration for promotion falling under the following categories should be specifically brought to the notice of the Departmental Promotion Committees or Screening Committees:-

(1) Officers under suspension;

(II) Officers in respect of whom a charge sheet has been issued and the disciplinary proceedings are pending;

(III) Officers in respect of whom prosecution for a criminal charge is pending.

B. Officers who are facing enquiry, trial or investigation can be categorised into the following groups based on the nature of the allegations of charges pending against them or about to be instituted namely:-

(i) an officer with a clean record, the nature of charges or allegations against whom relate to minor lapses having no bearing on his integrity or efficiency, which even if held proved, would not stand in the way of his being promoted;

(ii) an officer whose record is such that he would not be promoted, Irrespective of the allegations or charges under enquiry, trial or Investigation; and

(iii) an officer whose record is such that he would have been promoted had he not been facing enquiry, trial or investigation, in respect of charges which, if held proved, would be sufficient to supersede him.

C. The suitability of the officers for inclusion in the panel should be considered on an overall assessment based on the record which should Include namely:-

(i) Adverse remarks recorded in the Annual Confidential reports, the penalties awarded and the bad reputation of the officer as vouchsafed by the Head of the Department and the Secretary to Government of the Department concerned;

The above cases should be considered as falling under category (II) of item (B) above.

(ii) The officers who do not have any adverse entry in the Annual Confidential Report, and who have no penalties awarded against them in the entire duration of the post and not merely in the past five years and whose reputation is vouchsafed by the Head of the CAS Department and Secretary to Government of the Department concerned should be considered as falling under category (iii) of Item (B) above.

The officers categorised as under item (III) of G.O.Ms.No.424, GA (Ser.C) Dept., dated 25-05-76 as mentioned above only should be considered for adhoc promotion after completion of two years from the date of the Departmental Promotion committee or Screening committee Meeting in which their cases were considered for the first time.

6. The appointing authority should consider and decide that it would not be against public interest to allow ad hoc promotion to the officer concerned and this shall be decided with reference to the charge under enquiry. If the charge is one of moral turpitude, misappropriation, embezzlement and grave dereliction of duty then the appointing authority should consider as not in the public interest to consider ad hoc promotion to such charged officer. But, however, if the charge is not a grave one but is a minor one, not involving moral turpitude, embezzlement and grave dereliction of duty then only in such cases he appointing authority should consider that it would not be against public interest to allow ad hoc promotion because till then his record is clean

with reference to ACRs, past punishment and reputation in the department as vouchsafed by the Head of the Department and Secretary to Government. The appointing authorities should strive to finalise the disciplinary cases pursuing them vigorously so that within two years the proceedings are concluded and final orders issued.

7. If the Officer concerned is acquitted, in the criminal prosecution on the merits of the case or is fully exonerated in the departmental proceedings, the ad hoc promotion already made may be confirmed and the promotion treated as a regular one from the date of the ad hoc promotion with all attendant benefits. In case the officer could have normally got his regular promotion from a date prior to the date of his ad hoc promotion with reference to his placement in the Departmental Promotion Committee proceedings and the actual date of promotion of the person ranked immediately junior to him by the Departmental Promotion committee, he would also be allowed his due seniority and benefit of notional promotion.

8. If the Officer is not acquitted on merits in the criminal prosecution but purely on technical grounds and Government either proposes to take up the matter to a higher Court or to proceed against him departmentally or if the Officer is not exonerated in the departmental proceedings, the adhoc promotion granted to him should be brought to an end.

9. All the Departments of Secretariat and Heads of Departments should follow the above instructions scrupulously and bring it to the notice of all the concerned.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

7. It is relevant to understand the tenor of para 6 of the G.O. which states that while considering an ad hoc promotion, the appointing authority should consider and decide as to whether it would be against the public interest or not. Further, the same provides that if the charge is one of moral turpitude, misappropriation, embezzlement, and grave dereliction of duty then the appointing authority should consider it as not in the public interest to consider ad hoc promotion to such charged officer.

8. Considering the submissions made and in the light of the Government orders referred supra, the Writ Petition is disposed of, directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner according to individual rules and law. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 29.10.2024

SAB

**

HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

W.P.No.24569 of 2024

Dt.28.10.2024

SAB