

S. RENUKA AND ORS.
v.
STATE OF A.P. AND ANR.

A

MARCH 21, 2002

[G.B. PATTANAIK, S.N. PHUKAN AND S.N. VARIAVA, JJ.]

B

Service Law:

Appointment—Requirement of women Judges for Family Court and Mahila Court—Scarcity of adequate number of woman judges—Sanction of posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade II for appointment—All the posts reserved for women after relaxation of Rule 2 of Special Rules of the A.P. State Higher Judicial Service—Reservation for SC, ST and Backward Classes provided—Selection made—On State's request—High Court opined that the candidates could not be appointed—Opinion of High Court challenged in Supreme Court—Held, petitioners have no right to claim an appointment, as the selection was de-hors the Special Rules and reservation policy—They cannot be appointed even on ex-cadre post, as the same would amount to creating ex-cadre post by Court and would be against Rules.

C

After establishment of Family Courts and Mahila Courts, High Court desired to post women Judges in such Courts. In view of in-sufficient number of women Judges 10 additional posts were sanctioned by the State. Advertisement was issued for appointment to the posts of District Judges, Grade II. Out of the 10 posts, 5 were for open competition, 2 for SC, one for ST, one for Backward Class category A and one for Backward Class, category B. But after selection process, High Court approved 9 names for the panel consisting of 7 from the open competition and one each from SC and Backward Class A category B. The names of 9 candidates were sent to State Government for appointment, informing that the appointments of the candidates shall be provisional as family court judges and they would be later recruited to Higher Judicial Service as District Judges, Grade II on the availability of vacancies reserved for women. State Government then requested High Court to express its views on certain aspects with regard to the selection.

E

F

G

Full Bench of the High Court opined that it was not in favour of

H

A recommending any candidate on provisional selection for appointment as District & Sessions Judge, Grade-II in A.P. State Higher Judicial Service. The view of the Court was that the Selection process was illegal and contrary to rules, as eventual absorption of the candidates appointed as Family Court Judges into the category of District Judges, Grade-II, was not permissible under Special Rules for the A.P. State Higher Judicial Service and the same

B also did not provide for keeping the provisionally selected District Judges within-service as Family Court and Mahila Court Judges; and that earmarking of all the additional posts only to women amounted to cent percent reservation which was not permissible under Rule 2 of the Special Rules; and the relaxation of the Rule for Higher Judicial Services was not permissible,

C and that the selection was against Reservation Policy as the vacancies relating to SC & ST candidates were de-reserved and the vacancies of Backward Classes Group A, B, C & D were converted into other categories; and that the Selection was also not proper since the candidates had got less marks than normally prescribed for such selection.

D Petitioners-the selected candidates filed the present writ petition seeking direction for their appointment in the cadre of District and Sessions Judge Grade II. After subsequent advertisement for appointment of six posts of District Judges wherein only one post was reserved for women, petitioners amended the petition for further directions for quashing the decision of the

E full court not to appoint as per the selection earlier made and for quashing the subsequent advertisement.

The petitioners contended that they could be appointed on the ex-cadre posts as Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts.

F Dismissing the writ petition, the Court

G HELD : 1. No right accrues to a person merely because a person is selected and his or her name is put on a panel. The Petitioners have no right to claim an appointment. Even otherwise, the selection was contrary to the rules in force at that time. There could not be 100% reservation for women. Also the reservation policy had not been adhered to. The posts which are created are posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade II. There is no separate posts for Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts. Thus the Petitioners could not be appointed as Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts in ex-cadre posts even provisionally. This would amount to creation of Ex-cadre posts not sanctioned by the Government. No fault can be found

H with the High Court being in favour of not appointing the petitioners. The

selection was entirely against the rules and against the reservation policy. The rules also required that if no SC or ST candidate was available then the vacancy had to be carried forward. Similarly the vacancy of Backward Class Group A, B, C and/or D could not be converted into other category. A

[706-D-E; 705-F-G]

2. The High Court correctly realised that the petitioners could not be appointed in ex-cadre posts as Family Court and/or Mahila Court Judges and then absorb them in the cadre of District and Sessions Judge, Grade II as and when vacancy for women arose. It was also noticed that the candidates provisionally selected i.e. the petitioners, had got less marks than those normally prescribed for such selection. [705-G-H; 706-A] B

3. Court cannot direct the State Government to appoint these petitioners on ex-cadre posts as Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts. If such a direction were to be given this Court would be creating ex-cadre posts and making appointments contrary to rules. [707-B, C] C

R.S. Mittal v. Union of India, [1995] Supp. 2 SCC 230 and *Munna Roy v. Union of India*, [2000] 9 SCC 283, distinguished. D

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION : Writ Petition (C) No. 490 of 2000.

(Under Article 32 of Constitution of India)

L.N. Rao, P.N. Mishra, Santhana Krishnan, Ms. Manita Verma and Sunil Kumar, Advs. with them for the Petitioners. E

Ms. K. Amareswari, P.P. Rao, K. Subba Rao, Prem Malhotra, R. Madhavi Latha and T.V. Ratnam for the Respondents. F

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

S.N. VARIAVA, J. 1. The facts relevant for the purposes of this Writ Petition are as follows:

The State of Andhra Pradesh established Family Courts and Mahila Courts. The High Court of Andhra Pradesh desired that these Courts be manned by women. However in the cadre of District and Sessions Judges, Grade II there were not enough women Judges who could be posted in these Courts. Therefore the High Court requested the State to create additional posts. On 3rd September, 1996 the State Government issued Office Memorandum No. 172 sanctioning 10 additional posts of District and Sessions H

A Judges, Grade II. The relevant portion of the said Memorandum reads as follows:

B “The Registrar, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, has informed in his letter 6th read above that six Family Courts in the cadre of District and Sessions Judge were sanctioned at Visakhapatnam, Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Kurnool, Tirupathi and Warangal in the G. O. 3rd read above and another Family Court at Secunderabad was sanctioned in the G. O. 5th read above. The Registrar, High Court of Andhra Pradesh has further stated that the High Court considers it necessary to post lady District Judges to preside over the Family Courts in the State with a view to protect and preserve that institution of marriage and to promote the welfare of the children as stipulated in Rule 4 (4) (a) and (b) of the Family Court Act, 1984, but due to non availability of women judicial Officers in the cadre of District Judges, the High Court is unable to post Lady District Judges to the Family Courts. The Registrar has also stated that Mahila Courts with Lady presiding Officers at Hyderabad, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam were sanctioned exclusively to deal with offences against women, in the G.Os. first and fourth read above. The Registrar, High Court of Andhra Pradesh has finally requested that 10 posts of District and Sessions Judge, Grade-II, be sanctioned in addition to the existing cadre strength, exclusively to recruit the women candidates by direct recruitment, for being posted to the Family Courts and Mahila Courts in the State.

F 2. Government after careful consideration of the matter hereby sanction in relaxation of Rule 2 of the Special Rules for the A. P. State Higher Judicial Service, 10 posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade-II, in addition to the existing cadre strength, exclusively for women candidates to be recruited by direct recruitment.”

G 2. Pursuant to this Memorandum the High Court issued an Advertisement inviting applications from women candidates for appointment to the post of District and Sessions Judge, Grade-II. The advertisement specified that five posts would be available for open competition, two posts for the Scheduled Castes, one post for the Scheduled Tribe, one post for Backward Class Group A and one post for Backward Class Group B.

H 3. Pursuant to this advertisement 261 candidates applied for the posts. The High Court called 210 candidates for a written examination. 180 candidates

participated in the written examination. The High Court then called 35 candidates for oral interviews. The oral interviews were conducted on 20th and 21st of March, 1997. A panel of 10 candidates was prepared. The 10 candidates were asked to furnish further information relating to their legal practice. After receipt of the information the High Court rejected one name. A panel of nine candidates was then approved at Full Court meetings held on 17th September, 1997 and again on 17th October, 1997. This panel consisted of seven candidates from the open category, one from Scheduled Caste and one from Backward Class Group D. The High Court then sent the names of the nine candidates to the State Government for appointment.

4. The State Government brought to the notice of the High Court certain aspects and requested the High Court to consider the same and express its views. The aspects brought to the notice of the High Court were as follows:

“1. As Rule 22 of the A. P. State and Subordinate Service Rules old or new prescribes a specific procedure either for filling of S.C. and S.T. vacancies with O.C. candidates or for de-reserving such vacancies, it is for the consideration whether the 7th and 8th vacancies in the recruitment reserved for SCs and STs respectively can straightaway be de-reserved which is not in consonance with the said Rule 22.

2. As the notification inviting the applications for the post in question was issued much later to 18-3-1996, the principles of carry forward of vacancies in respect of BCs also applies to the recruitment. The recommendation of the High Court at roster points 4th and 10th reserved for BC.A and BC.B groups respectively, required consideration in the light of rules issued in G.O.Ms.No. 65, General Administration (Ser.D) Dept., Dated:15-2-1997.

3. The High Court informed that the appointments of the nine provisionally selected candidates shall be provisionally as Family Court Judges under the Family Courts Act to man Family Courts and Mahila Courts only. As the proposal for sanction and notification are for the posts of District and Sessions Judges Grade.II, it is for consideration whether the candidates provisionally appointed in such recruitment can now be provisionally appointed designating them as Family Courts Judges.

4. The High Court has stated that the nine recommended candidates to be provisionally appointed as Family Court Judges would be

A recruited into Higher Judicial Service as District Judges Grade II as and when vacancies in the cadre to the extent of reservation for women become available in order of their merit subject to the rule of reservation, it has to be considered in view of Rule 2 of the Special Rules and whether they can be so adjusted as suggested in view of Rule 6 of the Special Rules.

B

5. Whether the provisionally selected candidates recruited as District Judges in the Andhra Pradesh State Higher Judicial Service can be kept out of the service by provisional appointment to some other post and recruiting them into the posts of District Judges on the availability of vacancies reserved for Women.

C

6. The appointments to the posts of District Judges shall be made by the Governor of the State, whereas under the Family Courts Act, 1984, the State Government appoints persons to be judges of the Family Courts. Hence the appropriate procedure to be adopted for making the suggested appointments may also be considered."

D

5. The High Court considered the aspects brought to its notice in a meeting of the Full Court held on 21st November, 2000. The High Court then replied to the State Government as follows:

E

"For Query No. 1:

As per the rules in force, the vacancies relating to SC and ST Candidates cannot be straightaway de-reserved. If there are no qualified candidates of SC and ST available, the said vacancies have to be carried forward for Limited Recruitment. Therefore, the High Court is of the view that the vacancies reserved for SC and ST candidates cannot be de-reserved.

F

For Query No. 2:

G

As per the rules in force, the vacancies relating to each category of candidates belonging Backward Class Group A,B,C and D cannot be converted into other categories and they have to be carried forward for Limited Recruitment, if the candidates belonging to each sub-group are not available. Therefore, the High Court is of the view that the vacancies reserved for each sub group cannot be filled up with the candidates of other sub groups.

H

For Query No. 3:

The advertisement for the recruitment of women candidates was made inviting applications for the posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II. The Government accorded sanction of 10 additional posts in G.O.Ms.No.172, Law (LA&J SCF) Department dated:3.9.1996. There is no provision in the Special Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service for eventual absorption of the candidates appointed as Family Court Judges into the Cadre of District Judges, Grade.II against the future vacancies falling with the direct recruitment quota. In this regard, two aspects viz., (1) suitability test from the point of view of merit of the candidates and (2) Legality of recruitment by inviting applications exclusively from women candidates only, have been considered by the High Court.

Regarding the suitability, it is noticed by the High Court that the candidates who were provisionally selected have got less marks even if 40% is taken as minimum marks for Ocs and 30% for Scs and Sts for the purpose of selection as District Judges Grade.II. The recommendation through the letter 4th cited, was for appointment of the women candidates as Family Court Judges and not as District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II. The High Court, therefore, is of the view that it is not conducive to the efficiency in service and the image of Judiciary if the candidates who have got such lower marks are inducted into Higher Judicial Service.

Regarding the legality of recruitment, the High Court is of the view that there are formidable legal impediments in the way of recommending the candidates for appointment as District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II. The High Court is of the further view that the Spl. Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service issued in exercise of powers conferred under Article 233 and the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India and those rules enjoin that 33.1/3% of the total number of permanent posts shall be filled or reserved to be filled by direct recruitment. The Government accorded sanction of 10 posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II in addition to the existing cadre strength exclusively for women candidates to be recruited by direct recruitment. This was purportedly done by relaxation of rule 2 of the Special Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service. Rule 2 provides for method of appointment and the proportion between the recruits by transfer (Promotees) and direct recruits from the Bar. By

A resorting to relaxation of the said rule, it is not legally permissible to earmark 10 sanctioned posts exclusively for direct recruitment of women candidates since there is no rule in the A.P. State Higher Judicial Service giving the power to relax any of the rules. The power to relax the rules would only be under the A.P. State and Subordinate Service rules. Even if there is such power, it is doubtful whether the basic rules of recruitment can be relaxed in view of the rulings of the Supreme Court in *Keshav Chandra Joshi v. Union of India*, AIR (1991) SC 284 and in *J & K Public Service Commission v. Narinder Mohan*, AIR (1994) SC 1808. The High Court is of the further view that ear-marking 10 additional posts sanctioned only to the women candidates amount to cent percent reservation in favour of women which is not legal/constitutionally permissible. Even if the reservation provided under Rule 22-A of the A.P. State and Subordinate Service Rules is made applicable to A.P. State Higher Judicial Service, the reservation could be to the extent of 1/3rd only.

D *For Query No. 4:*

E Since there is no rule under the Spl. Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service to absorb the Family Courts Judges into the Higher Judicial Service as District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II as and when vacancies in the cadre to the extent of reservation for women become available, the High Court is of the view that they cannot be absorbed in view of Rule 2 read with Rule 6 of the Special Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service.

For Query No. 5:

F According to Rule 6 of the Spl. Rules for A.P. State Higher Judicial Service, seniority of a person appointed to the category of District and Sessions Judges, shall be determined with reference to the date from which he was continuously on duty in the category. The Spl. Rules do not provide to keep provisionally selected District Judges out of service as Family Court and Mahila Court Judges and recruiting them into the posts of District Judges as and when vacancies for women for direct recruitment become available in order to their merit and subject to the rule of reservation. Therefore, the High Court is of the view that the provisionally selected candidates as District Judges cannot be kept out of that service by provisional appointment

to some other post and recruiting them into the posts of District Judges on the availability of vacancies reserved for women. A

For Query No. 6:

In view of the above views expressed by the High Court, this query needs no clarification. B

In the light of the above views for the queries raised by the Government, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh is not in favour of recommending any women candidates on provisional selection for appointment as District and Sessions Judges, Grade.II under the A.P. State Higher Judicial Service in pursuance of the Notification issued on the basis of the High Court's letter No. 4610/96-B.Spl Dated: 7.10.1996." C

Thus the Full Court, in its meeting held on 21st November, 2000 was not in favour of appointing any person from the Panel prepared earlier.

6. It must be noted that the vacancies were for Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts. These Courts could be manned by District and Sessions Judges, Grade II. The State Government had thus created 10 posts of District and Sessions Judge, Grade II. The advertisement was also for appointment to the posts of District and Sessions Judge, Grade II. The appointments were to be not to any ex-cadre posts but to posts in the cadre of District and Sessions Judge, Grade II. The rules prescribed that in the cadre of District and Sessions Judges there had to be reservations for Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Caste, Backward Classes (groups A, B, C or D) and women. The rules did not allow 100% reservation for women. By reserving all the 10 posts for women the High Court had inadvertently created a 100% reservation for women. Further the posts advertised were 5 open competition, 2 Scheduled Caste, 1 Scheduled Tribe, 1 Backward Class Group A and 1 Backward Class Group B. Yet the panel sent to the Government consisted of 7 open competition candidates, 1 Scheduled Caste candidate and 1 Backward Class Group D candidate. Such a selection was entirely against the rules and against the reservation policy. The rules also required that if no SC or ST candidate was available then the vacancy had to be carried forward. Similarly the vacancy of Backward Class group A, B, C and/or D could not be converted into other category. Because of these difficulties the persons empanelled could not be appointed in the cadre of District and Sessions Judge Grade II. The High Court initially considered that the Petitioners could be appointed in ex-cadre posts as Family Court and/or Mahila Court Judges and then absorb them in the cadre of H

A District and Sessions Judge, Grade II as and when vacancy for women arose. The High Court correctly realised that this could not be done. It was also noticed that the candidates provisionally selected i.e. the Petitioners had got less marks than those normally prescribed for such selection.

B 7. It must be mentioned that in the meantime the Petitioners had made representations both to the Chief Justice as well as to the Chief Minister. They received no reply. This Writ Petition was thus filed by the nine women lawyers who were selected and whose names were forwarded to the State Government for appointment. The Petitioners sought directions to appoint them in the cadre of District and Sessions Judges, Grade II. Thereafter on C 20th July, 2000 another advertisement was issued calling for applications for appointment to six posts of District Judges. In this advertisement only one post was reserved for women. The Petition was thus amended and a further direction to quash the decision of the Full Court not to appoint as per the selection earlier made and to quash the subsequent advertisement have been sought.

D 8. It is settled law that no right accrues to a person merely because a person is selected and his or her name is put on a panel. The Petitioners have no right to claim an appointment. Even otherwise, the selection was contrary to the rules in force at that time. There could not be 100% reservation for women. Also the reservation policy had not been adhered to. The posts E which are created are posts of District and Sessions Judges, Grade II. There is no separate posts for Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts. Thus the Petitioners could not be appointed as Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts in ex-cadre posts even provisionally. This would amount to creation of Ex-cadre posts not sanctioned by the Government. No fault can be found F with the High Court being in favour of not appointing the Petitioners.

9. The unfortunate part is that even though Family Court and Mahila Courts have been established no appointments have been made. Thus, till date the Family Courts and Mahila Courts are not being manned.

G 10. Mr. Nageshwar Rao has relied upon the case of *R. S. Mittal v. Union of India* reported in [1995] Supp. 2 SCC 230. In this case even though the Court was of the opinion that the selection was not proper, it refused to interfere. Mr. Nageshwar Rao also relied on the case of *Munna Roy v. Union of India*, reported in [2000] 9 SCC 283. In this case the Court directed H appointment of the selected candidate in spite of the fact that she had no right

to the appointment. Both these cases are based on the peculiar facts of those cases. A

11. As the posts were lying vacant for such a long period of time initially it was suggested that if the Petitioners filed an undertaking before this Court, that they are willing to be appointed in ex-cadre posts of Judges of the Family Court and/or Mahila Court and that they will not claim any right to be subsequently absorbed in the cadre of District and Sessions Judges Grade II then the Court could consider directing the State Government to appoint these nine Petitioners. Eight of these Petitioners have filed undertakings before this Court. However on a proper consideration of the matter, we are of the view that this Court cannot direct the State Government to appoint these Petitioners. If such a direction were to be given this Court would be creating ex-cadre posts and making appointments contrary to rules. Thus it is not possible for this Court to accede to the request of Mr. Nageshwar Rao to appoint Petitioners, on the ex-cadre posts, as Judges of Family Courts and Mahila Courts. B C

12. Writ Petition is thus dismissed. There will be no Order as to costs.

K.K.T.

Petition dismissed.