

S.Sunilchandra Sharma Vs State of Manipur**Civil Rule No. 38 of 1987**

Court: Gauhati High Court**Date of Decision:** Sept. 20, 1989**Acts Referred:**

Manipur Police Service Rules, 1965 – Rule 5(1)(b), 5(1)(b)

Citation: (1991) 2 GLJ 335**Hon'ble Judges:** S.N.Phukan, J and M.Sharma, J**Bench:** Division Bench**Advocate:** N.Pramod Chandra Singh, B.P.Sahu, Advocates appearing for Parties

Judgement

S.N. Phukan, J.

The petitioner in this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution was appointed as Assistant SubInspector of Police and

in the year 1986 he was promoted on officiating basis as SubInspector of Police. He was awarded Police Medal for gallantry with a monthly

allowance of Rs.60/ in the year 1970 and again in the year 1978 he was awarded President Police Medal with a monthly allowance of Rs.60/. On

17.11.78 he was appointed on adhoc basis as Inspector of Police. It is stated that the said adhoc appointment was made in recognition of gallantry

displayed by him and another Assistant SubInspector of Police during an encounter on 12.11.78 with Meitei Extremists. In the year 1981 again he

was awarded Bar to the President Police Medal for gallantry with an allowance of Rs.40/ per month and in 1982 Police Medal for meritorious

service was awarded to the petitioner on the Republic Day, Petitioner was given regular appointment as Inspector of Police on the recommendation

of the departmental promotion Committee on 4.5.82 and he was confirmed in the said post on 27.5.87. The main grievance of the petitioner is that

in view of his meritorious service rendered in the Police Department his appointment to "the service known as Manipur Police Service constituted

under the Manipur Police Service Rules, 1965 should have been considered by taking his entire length of service as Inspector from the date of his

ad hoc appointment to the said post.

2. In the counter filed on behalf of the respondents regarding various Medals awarded to the petitioner and his ad hoc appointment have not been

denied. The appointment of the petitioner on regular basis as Inspector and the subsequent confirmation have also not been denied. It has however

been stated that the case of the petitioner along with 92 officers for regular promotion to the post of Inspector was considered by the Departmental

Promotion Committee on 28.2.80, but it was found that there were officers with "Outstanding" and "Very good" annual confidential reports

whereas in such reports of the petitioner he was graded as "Good". As regular promotion was on the basis of merit cum seniority the petitioner

could not be appointed on regular basis in 1980. It has further been stated that appointment on ad hoc basis does not confer any, right for

promotion on regular basis. Regarding the appointment of the petitioner in the Manipur Police ""Service respondents have stated that the petitioner

was too junior" to be considered for appointment in that service.

3. We have heard Mr. Sahu, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Pramod Singh, learned Senior Government Advocate.

4. Mr. Sahu does not dispute the statement that no officer who was appointed on regular basis as Inspector and junior to the petitioner, has been

appointed as a Member of Manipur Police Service. Main argument of Mr. Sahu is that if the appointment of the petitioner on ad hoc basis would

have been taken into account the case of the petitioner for appointment to the above service should have been considered long back.

5. Relying on the decision of the Apex Court in Ashok Gulati vs. B.S. Jain, AIR 1987 SC 424, learned Senior Government Advocate has rightly

urged that service rendered on ad hoc basis or by stop gap arrangement cannot be considered. According to Mr. Pramod Singh the petitioner

cannot claim to be appointed in the Manipur Police Service on the basis of his ad hoc appointment from 17.11.78 to 4.5.82.

6. Rule 5 (1) (b) of the Manipur Police Service Rules, 1965, inter alia, provides that fifty percent of the substantive vacancies in the Manipur Police

Service shall be filled up by selection from amongst officers who are substantively borne in the cadre Inspector of Police, Prosecuting Inspectors,

Police (Prosecutors and Junior Commissioned Officers of Manipur Rifles. Thus the Rule is clear that only person holding any post mentioned in the

said clause

(b) of Rule 5(1) substantively can be considered for appointment to the service namely Manipur Police Service. We are, therefore, of the opinion,

in view of the above rule that petitioner cannot claim to be appointed in the said service by virtue of his ad hoc appointment. The case of the

petitioner can be considered only after his regular appointment as Inspector of Police. For gallantry displayed by the petitioner he has been

decorated with Medals and Has also been given monetary benefit. In the above rule there is no provision that by virtue of Medals and awards

obtained by any officer, he can claim to be appointed in the Manipur Police Service. We have also noted that there is no allegation that any Junior

Officer has been appointed to the service.

7. For the reasons stated above we do not find any merit in the present petition and as such it is dismissed, which he we hereby do.

In the result petition is dismissed. No costs.