

A

BHUDEV SHARMA

v.

DISTRICT JUDGE, BULANDSHAHAR AND ANR.

OCTOBER 31, 2007

B

[A.K. MATHUR AND MARKANDEY KATJU, JJ.]

Service Law—Reservation—For Physically handicapped persons—Selection—For Class III posts—2% posts reserved for physically handicapped—Single Physically handicapped person applied and appeared in recruitment test—Denied appointment—Held: The applicant was entitled to be appointed against the reserved post, being the only candidate.

30 posts were advertised for Class III Posts in Bulandshahr Judgeship in U.P., Appellant (a blind man) appeared in recruitment test, but was not selected. He filed Writ Petition. Single Judge of High Court directed his appointment, but the same was set aside by Division Bench of High Court. Hence the present appeal.

E

Allowing the appeal, the Court

HELD: By G.O. dated 26.08.1993 U.P. Government has reserved 2% posts for physically handicapped persons for direct recruitment in all groups of Government services. The physically handicapped persons are those who are blind, deaf and dumb and otherwise handicapped. There were altogether 30 posts for which the selection was held. 2 per cent of 30 is 0.6. Since 0.6 is more than half it is rounded off and held that one out of the 30 posts is reserved for physically handicapped persons. Since there was no other physically handicapped person who applied, the appellant was entitled to the post reserved for physically handicapped persons. The appellant is already working on the post in view of the interim order of this Court. Hence he shall be regularized.

[Paras 3 and 5] [731-E, F, G; 732-A]

H

[MARKANDEY KATJU, J.]

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 6168 of A
2001.

From the final Judgment and Order dated 23.5.2001 of the High
Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Special Appeal No. 445 of 2001.

Gaurav Jain and Abha Jain for the Appellant. B

Ashok K. Srivastava for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

MARKANDEY KATJU, J. 1. This appeal has been filed against C
the impugned judgment of the Allahabad High Court dated 23.05.2001
in Special Appeal No. 445 of 2001. Heard learned counsel for the parties
and perused the record.

2. The appellant is a blind man. He appeared in the recruitment test D
held in the year 1992 for selecting candidates for Class-III Posts in
Bulandshahr Judgeship in U.P. However, he was not selected and hence
he filed a writ petition which was allowed by a learned Single Judge of
the Allahabad High Court by his judgment dated 25.09.1997. Against
that judgment the State Government filed a letters patent appeal which
has been allowed by the impugned judgment by the Division Bench. Hence E
this appeal.

3. The appellant has relied on G.O. dated 26.08.1993 which is
Annexure P-I to this appeal. That G.O. states that the U.P. Government
has reserved 2 per cent posts for physically handicapped persons for direct
recruitment in all groups of Government services. The physically
handicapped persons are those who are blind, deaf and dumb and
otherwise handicapped. There were altogether 30 posts for which the
selection was held. 2 per cent of 30 is 0.6. Since 0.6 is more than half
we round it off and hold that one out of the 30 posts is reserved for
physically handicapped persons. Since there was no other physically
handicapped person who applied, in our opinion, the appellant was entitled
to the post reserved for physically handicapped persons. G

4. In this view of the matter, the appeal is allowed, the impugned H

A judgment of the Division Bench is set aside and it is directed that the appellant be appointed on a Class-III Post in Bulandshahr Judgeship forthwith.

5. We are informed that the appellant is already working on the post in view of the interim order of this Court. Hence he shall be regularized and allowed to continue working as a regular Class-III employee and shall be given all the consequential benefits.

K.K.T.

Appeal allowed.

Sl. No.	Text	Page No.
1	1	126
2	2	128
3	3	129
4	4	130
5	5	131
6	6	132
7	7	133
8	8	134
9	9	135
10	10	136
11	11	137
12	12	138
13	13	139
14	14	140
15	15	141
16	16	142
17	17	143
18	18	144
19	19	145
20	20	146
21	21	147
22	22	148
23	23	149
24	24	150
25	25	151
26	26	152
27	27	153
28	28	154
29	29	155
30	30	156
31	31	157
32	32	158
33	33	159
34	34	160
35	35	161
36	36	162
37	37	163
38	38	164
39	39	165
40	40	166
41	41	167
42	42	168
43	43	169
44	44	170
45	45	171
46	46	172
47	47	173
48	48	174
49	49	175
50	50	176
51	51	177
52	52	178
53	53	179
54	54	180
55	55	181
56	56	182
57	57	183
58	58	184
59	59	185
60	60	186
61	61	187
62	62	188
63	63	189
64	64	190
65	65	191
66	66	192
67	67	193
68	68	194
69	69	195
70	70	196
71	71	197
72	72	198
73	73	199
74	74	200
75	75	201
76	76	202
77	77	203
78	78	204
79	79	205
80	80	206
81	81	207
82	82	208
83	83	209
84	84	210
85	85	211
86	86	212
87	87	213
88	88	214
89	89	215
90	90	216
91	91	217
92	92	218
93	93	219
94	94	220
95	95	221
96	96	222
97	97	223
98	98	224
99	99	225
100	100	226
101	101	227
102	102	228
103	103	229
104	104	230
105	105	231
106	106	232
107	107	233
108	108	234
109	109	235
110	110	236
111	111	237
112	112	238
113	113	239
114	114	240
115	115	241
116	116	242
117	117	243
118	118	244
119	119	245
120	120	246
121	121	247
122	122	248
123	123	249
124	124	250
125	125	251
126	126	252
127	127	253
128	128	254
129	129	255
130	130	256
131	131	257
132	132	258
133	133	259
134	134	260
135	135	261
136	136	262
137	137	263
138	138	264
139	139	265
140	140	266
141	141	267
142	142	268
143	143	269
144	144	270
145	145	271
146	146	272
147	147	273
148	148	274
149	149	275
150	150	276
151	151	277
152	152	278
153	153	279
154	154	280
155	155	281
156	156	282
157	157	283
158	158	284
159	159	285
160	160	286
161	161	287
162	162	288
163	163	289
164	164	290
165	165	291
166	166	292
167	167	293
168	168	294
169	169	295
170	170	296
171	171	297
172	172	298
173	173	299
174	174	300
175	175	301
176	176	302
177	177	303
178	178	304
179	179	305
180	180	306
181	181	307
182	182	308
183	183	309
184	184	310
185	185	311
186	186	312
187	187	313
188	188	314
189	189	315
190	190	316
191	191	317
192	192	318
193	193	319
194	194	320
195	195	321
196	196	322
197	197	323
198	198	324
199	199	325
200	200	326
201	201	327
202	202	328
203	203	329
204	204	330
205	205	331
206	206	332
207	207	333
208	208	334
209	209	335
210	210	336
211	211	337
212	212	338
213	213	339
214	214	340
215	215	341
216	216	342
217	217	343
218	218	344
219	219	345
220	220	346
221	221	347
222	222	348
223	223	349
224	224	350
225	225	351
226	226	352
227	227	353
228	228	354
229	229	355
230	230	356
231	231	357
232	232	358
233	233	359
234	234	360
235	235	361
236	236	362
237	237	363
238	238	364
239	239	365
240	240	366
241	241	367
242	242	368
243	243	369
244	244	370
245	245	371
246	246	372
247	247	373
248	248	374
249	249	375
250	250	376
251	251	377
252	252	378
253	253	379
254	254	380
255	255	381
256	256	382
257	257	383
258	258	384
259	259	385
260	260	386
261	261	387
262	262	388
263	263	389
264	264	390
265	265	391
266	266	392
267	267	393
268	268	394
269	269	395
270	270	396
271	271	397
272	272	398
273	273	399
274	274	400
275	275	401
276	276	402
277	277	403
278	278	404
279	279	405
280	280	406
281	281	407
282	282	408
283	283	409
284	284	410
285	285	411
286	286	412
287	287	413
288	288	414
289	289	415
290	290	416
291	291	417
292	292	418
293	293	419
294	294	420
295	295	421
296	296	422
297	297	423
298	298	424
299	299	425
300	300	426
301	301	427
302	302	428
303	303	429
304	304	430
305	305	431
306	306	432
307	307	433
308	308	434
309	309	435
310	310	436
311	311	437
312	312	438
313	313	439
314	314	440
315	315	441
316	316	442
317	317	443
318	318	444
319	319	445
320	320	446
321	321	447
322	322	448
323	323	449
324	324	450
325	325	451
326	326	452
327	327	453
328	328	454
329	329	455
330	330	456
331	331	457
332	332	458
333	333	459
334	334	460
335	335	461
336	336	462
337	337	463
338	338	464
339	339	465
340	340	466
341	341	467
342	342	468
343	343	469
344	344	470
345	345	471
346	346	472
347	347	473
348	348	474
349	349	475
350	350	476
351	351	477
352	352	478
353	353	479
354	354	480
355	355	481
356	356	482
357	357	483
358	358	484
359	359	485
360	360	486
361	361	487
362	362	488
363	363	489
364	364	490
365	365	491
366	366	492
367	367	493
368	368	494
369	369	495
370	370	496
371	371	497
372	372	498
373	373	499
374	374	500
375	375	501
376	376	502
377	377	503
378	378	504
379	379	505
380	380	506
381	381	507
382	382	508
383	383	509
384	384	510
385	385	511
386	386	512
387	387	513
388	388	514
389	389	515
390	390	516
391	391	517
392	392	518
393	393	519
394	394	520
395	395	521
396	396	522
397	397	523
398	398	524
399	399	525
400	400	526
401	401	527
402	402	528
403	403	529
404	404	530
405	405	531
406	406	532
407	407	533
408	408	534
409	409	535
410	410	536
411	411	537
412	412	538
413	413	539
414	414	540
415	415	541
416	416	542
417	417	543
418	418	544
419	419	545
420	420	546
421	421	547
422	422	548
423	423	549
424	424	550
425	425	551
426	426	552
427	427	553
428	428	554
429	429	555
430	430	556

JASLOK HOSPITAL & RESEARCH CENTRE

A

v.

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

OCTOBER 31, 2007

[ASHOK BHAN, HARJIT SINGH BEDI AND
V.S. SIRPURKAR, JJ.]

B

Customs Duty:

*Exemption Notification No. 64/88-Cus. Dated 1.3.1988—Table—
Paras 1 and 2—Assesseees granted Customs Duty Exemption
Certificates under para 2—CDEs withdrawn for violation of
conditions for grant of exemption—Three/four years thereafter
assesseees claiming change in category from para 2 to para 1—HELD:
Effect of withdrawal of CDEs is that assesseees are not entitled to
exemption under any clause of Table annexed to the Notification,
therefore, no question of change of category would arise—Besides,
change of category was sought after three/four years of withdrawal
of CDEs—It was clearly an afterthought in order to overcome
assesseees' failure to comply with conditions for grant of exemption.*

C

D

E

F

G

**Appellant in CA No. 7284 of 2005 obtained Customs Duty
Exemption Certificate for import of hospital equipments under
Notification No. 64/88-Cus. Dated 1.3.1988 for the period between
1988 and 1994. The appellant was categorized under para 2 of the
Table annexed to the Notification. The said certificate was cancelled
by communication dated 14.11.2000 on the ground that the appellant
hospital failed to comply with the condition laid down in para 2 to
provide free treatment to the patients mentioned therein. After lapse
of 3 years from the date of withdrawal of the exemption the appellant
made a representation for being categorized under para 1 of the
Table annexed to the Notification. The representation having been
rejected, the appellant filed a writ petition. The High Court declined
to grant the relief holding that the appellant having enjoyed the**

A benefit under para 2 for fifteen years could not claim change in the categorization.

In the instant appeals, relying upon the case of *Share Medical Care*¹, it was contended for the appellants that they were entitled to claim change in categorization and the authority concerned erred in holding otherwise.

Dismissing the appeals, the Court

HELD: 1. The appellant in CA No. 7284 of 2005 is not entitled to the relief sought for. The appellant had given up its challenge to the communication dated 14th November, 2000 cancelling/ withdrawing the CDECs issued to it in terms of para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification, for having violated the conditions laid down for grant of exemption. The effect of the withdrawal of CDEC is that the appellant is not entitled to the exemption under any of the clauses of the Notification on or after 14th November, 2000 and, therefore, no question of change of its category would arise. Such a change could only be possible if the appellant had applied for change of its categorization before the issuance of the communication of the DGHS dated 14th November, 2000 withdrawing/cancelling the CDECs. Besides this, the change of categorization sought after a lapse of three years of the withdrawal/cancellation of the CDECs could not be entertained at the sweet will of the appellant. It is clearly an after-thought in order to overcome the failure on the part of the appellant to comply with the conditions laid down in para 2.

F [Para 17 and 18] [739-A, B, C, D, E]

2. The appellant in the CA no. 5054 of 2007, filed the representation after a lapse of four years of the withdrawal/ cancellation of the CDECs, which could not have been entertained and the High Court has rightly upheld the order of rejection of the change of categorization. [Para 19] [739-F]

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 7284 of 2005.

JASLOK HOSPITAL & RESEARCH CENTRE v. UNION OF 735
INDIA [BHAN, J.]

From the final Judgment and Order dated 17.12.2004 of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Writ Petition No. 2613 of 2004.

WITH

C.A. No. 5054 of 2007.

Arun Jaitley, Gaurav Sharma, Pratibha Singh, Sumeet Bhati, Surbhi Mehta (for Maninder Singh), V. Lakshmikumaran and Alok Yadav (for M.P. Devanath) for the Appellant. B

Amrendra Sharan, ASG., K. Radhakrishnan, A.K. Srivastava, Binu Tamta, C.V.S. Rao, Sushma Suri and B. Krishna Prasad for the Respondents. C

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

BHAN, J. 1. Leave granted in special leave petition No. 17577 of 2006. D

2. This judgment shall dispose of Civil Appeal No.7284 of 2005 and the Civil Appeal arising out of SLP© No. 17577 of 2006.

3. C.A. No.7284/2005 is directed against the judgment and order passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in CWP No. 2613 of 2004 dated 17th December, 2004 whereby the High Court has dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant. E

4. The Civil Appeal arising out of SLP© No.17577 is directed against the order dated 21st September, 2006 passed by the same High Court in Writ Petition No.5594/2006. F

5. The latter case has been dismissed by the High Court on the basis of the findings recorded in the order dated 17th of December, 2004 passed in WP No.2613/2004 *M/s. Jaslok Hospital and Research Centre v. Union of India & Ors.* G

6. As the point involved in both the appeals is identical, the appeals are taken up for disposal together by this common Judgment.

7. For the convenience of reference, the facts are taken from C.A. No.7284/2005. H

A 8. The appellant obtained Customs Duty Exemption Certificate (for short 'CDEC'), from the Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS), for import of various hospital equipments under Notification No.64/88-Cus. Dated 1st March, 1988 (for short "the Notification"). CDECs issued to the appellant relate to import of medical equipments for the period B between 1988 and 1994. The CDECs certified that the appellant was covered under para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification. The same reads as under:

"TABLE

C 1. All such hospitals as may be certified by the said Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, to be run or substantially aided by such charitable organization as may be approved, from time to time, by the said Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

D 2. All such hospitals which may be certified by the said Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, in each case, to be run for providing medical, surgical or diagnostic treatment not only without any distinction of caste, creed, race, religion or language but also, -

E (a) free, on an average, to at least 40 per cent of all their outdoor patients; and

E (b) free to all indoor patients belonging to families with an income of less than rupees five hundred per month, and keeping for this purpose at least 10 per cent of all the hospital beds reserved for such patients; and

F (c) at reasonable charges, either on the basis of the income of the patients concerned or otherwise, to patients other than those specified in clauses (a) and (b)."

G 9. The said CDECs were cancelled/withdrawn by the Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS) vide its communication bearing No. Z.37024/13/92-MG dated 14th November, 2000 addressed to the Chief Executive Director of the appellant, on the ground that the appellant-hospital had failed to comply with the conditions laid down in para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification extracted above.

H 10. After about three years, the appellant made a representation to

the Secretary, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare on 24th September, A 2003, seeking categorization under para 1 (extracted below) instead of para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification.

“1.

organization as may be approved, from time to time, by the said B Ministry of Health and Family Welfare”

11. The said representation came to be rejected by the DGHS vide its order dated 18th March, 2004.

12. Against the rejection of its aforesaid representation, the appellant C filed the Writ Petition in the High Court, challenging the communication dated 14th November, 2000 issued by the DGHS, canceling / withdrawing the CDECs granted to the appellant, and the order dated 18th March, 2004, declining to categorize the appellant under para 1 of the Table annexed to the Notification. During the course of hearing before D the High Court, Counsel for the appellant did not press the prayer for setting aside the communication dated 14th November, 2000 and confined the challenge only to the order dated 18th March, 2004 passed by the DGHS.

13. Till the year 2003, the appellant accepted and was rather satisfied E of its being categorized under para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification. It was only after the withdrawal/cancellation of the said CDECs by the communication dated 14th November, 2000 and, that F too, after a lapse of almost three years, that the appellant made a representation to the Secretary to the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for being categorized under para 1 of the Table annexed to the G Notification.

14. The representation of the appellant, as stated above, was rejected by the DGHS on the ground that the State Government had recommended the appellant's case only under para 2 of the Table annexed G to the Notification which, *inter alia*, stipulates that the hospital has to provide free treatment to 40 per cent of the outdoor patients and to all indoor patients whose income is less than Rs.500/- per month.

15. The High Court, by the impugned order, has upheld the order H

- A passed by the DGHS. It has been held that the order passed by the DGHS is not based on irrelevant or extraneous considerations. That the appellant could not claim change in the categorization after having enjoyed the benefit under para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification for about fifteen years. During the said period of fifteen years, the appellant did not
- B raise any grievance with regard to its non-categorization under para 1 of the said Table and its categorization under para 2 thereof.

16. Counsel for the appellant contends that the appellant was entitled to claim change in the categorization and the DGHS has erred in holding that the appellant was not entitled to claim change in its categorization

- C from para 2 to para 1 of the Table annexed to the Notification. In support of his submission, the learned Counsel had relied upon a judgment of this Court in the case of *Share Medical Care v. Union of India & Ors.*, [2007] 4 SCC 573 wherein it has been held, thus:

- D "In the instant case, the ground which weighed with the Deputy Director General (Medical), DGHS for non-considering the prayer of the appellant was that earlier, exemption was sought under category 2 of exemption notification, not under category 3 of exemption notification and exemption under category 2 was withdrawn. This is hardly a ground sustainable in law. On the contrary, well settled law is that in case the applicant is entitled to benefit under two different Notifications or under two different Heads, he can claim more benefit and it is the *duty* of the authorities to grant such benefits if the applicant is otherwise entitled to such benefit. Therefore, non-consideration on the part of the Deputy Director General (Medical), DGHS to the prayer of the appellant in claiming exemption under category 3 of the notification is illegal and improper. The prayer ought to have been considered and decided on merits. Grant of exemption under category 2 of the notification or withdrawal of the said benefit cannot come in the way of the applicant in claiming exemption under category 3 if the conditions laid down thereunder have been fulfilled. The High Court also committed the same error and hence the order of the High Court also suffers from the same infirmity and is liable to be set aside."
- H

JASLOK HOSPITAL & RESEARCH CENTRE v. UNION OF 739
INDIA [BHAN, J.]

17. Without going into the question regarding applicability or A otherwise of the decision referred to above, we are of the view that the appellant is not entitled to the relief sought for. The appellant had given up its challenge to the communication dated 14th November, 2000 cancelling/ withdrawing the CDECs issued to the appellant for having violated the conditions laid down for grant of exemption. The effect of B the communication dated 14th November, 2000 is that the appellant is not entitled to the exemption under any of the clauses of the aforesaid Notification on or after 14th November, 2000. The representation made by the appellant after a lapse of three years of the cancellation/ withdrawal of the CDECs cannot be entertained, as the change of its category would not arise as the appellant's categorization under para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification had already been withdrawn. Such a change C could only be possible if the appellant had applied for change of its categorization before the issuance of the communication of the DGHS dated 14th November, 2000 withdrawing/cancelling the CDECs.

18. Apart from this, the change of categorization was sought after a D lapse of three years of the withdrawal/cancellation of the CDECs. Such a representation could not be entertained after a lapse of three years at the sweet will of the appellant. The representation filed by the appellant in 2003, seeking change of category from para 2 to para 1 of the Table annexed to the Notification, is clearly an after-thought in order to overcome the failure on the part of the appellant to comply with the conditions laid down in para 2 of the Table annexed to the Notification. The same could not be entertained after such a lapse of three years of the communication dated 14th November, 2000.

19. In the Appeal arising out of SLP© No. 17577 of 2006, the representation was filed after a lapse of four years of the withdrawal/ cancellation of the CDECs, which, as held in the preceding paragraphs, could not have been entertained and the High Court has rightly upheld the order of rejection of the change of categorization.

20. For the reasons stated above, we are not inclined to interfere with the orders passed by the High Court. The Civil Appeals are, therefore, dismissed with no order as to costs.

R.P.

Appeals dismissed.

H