

## **R.L. Meena And Ors vs Union Of India And Ors on 4 September, 2000**

**Equivalent citations: AIR 2000 SUPREME COURT 3043, 2000 (7) SCC 181, 2000 AIR SCW 3351, 2000 LAB. I. C. 3135, (2000) 10 JT 151 (SC), 2000 (6) SCALE 298, 2000 (8) SRJ 452, 2001 (3) LRI 687, 2000 SCC (L&S) 893, (2000) 87 FACLR 133, (2000) 4 LAB LN 594, (2000) 5 SERVLR 253, (2000) 6 SUPREME 138, (2000) 6 SCALE 298**

**Bench: M. Jagannadha Rao, Doraiswamy Raju**

CASE NO.:

Writ Petition (civil) 135 of 2000

PETITIONER:

R.L. MEENA AND ORS.

RESPONDENT:

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 04/09/2000

BENCH:

M. JAGANNADHA RAO & DORAISWAMY RAJU

JUDGMENT:

JUDGMENT 2000 Supp(3) SCR 100 The following Order of the Court was delivered :

The petitioners are officers of the Indian Police Service (IPS) in the Arunachal, Goa, Mizoram, Union Territories Cadre. They have all been promoted to the IPS from the Delhi and Andaman Nicobar Police Services which is one of the feeder services to the IPS. The petitioners filed these petitions under Article 32 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs. "Issuance of writ, order or direction quashing the notifications dated 31.12.97 being arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and for further directions that petitioners and all other similarly situated All India Service Officers may be granted all the benefits with effect from 29th April, 1985 the date of granting relief to Shri K.K. Goswami and other officials of the Madhya Pradesh Forest Services.

By the date this writ petition came up for hearing to this Court, this Court had disposed of Writ Petition No. 613 of 1994 and batch filed by the Tamil Nadu Administrative Services Officers Association against the Union of India and others.

At the time of admission of this writ petition on 28.7.2000 learned senior counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are seeking a direction similar to the one issued in the Tamil Nadu Officer's case referred to above which has since been reported in 2000 (3) SCALE 98.

After hearing learned Additional Solicitor General for the respondents, and the learned counsel for the petitioners, we are of the view that a similar direction is to be issued in this case also. We direct as follows:

"It is open to the petitioners to file a detailed representation to the Central Government, giving all the particulars of the post which they consider are fit to be encadred and special reasons why they should be encadred with a retrospective date and on such representation being made, the Central Government will consider these representations in consultation with the State Government concerned, and take appropriate decisions in this regard preferably within six months from the receipt of those representations. The petitions and appeal are disposed of accordingly. No costs."

The writ petition is disposed of in terms of the above directions.