

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED NIAS C.P.

MONDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER 2022/25TH ASWINA, 1944

O.P(KAT).NO.162 OF 2022

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 18.05.2022 IN O.A.(EKM).NO.388/2021 OF  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/APPLICANT IN O.A.:

- 1 PRAVEEN K.R  
AGED 31 YEARS  
KIZHAKKEPURA HOUSE, POOTHANOR P.O., MUNDUR,  
PALAKKAD , PIN - 678592
- 2 C.V RAHUL  
AGED 34 YEARS  
CHOZHAN HOUSE, PANAYUR P.O., POLPULLY, PALAKKAD,  
PIN - 678552

BY ADV.SRI.P.NANDAKUMAR

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN O.A:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO  
GOVERNMENT, HOME DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 2 THE STATE POLICE CHIEF  
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM ,  
PIN - 695010
- 3 THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE  
ARMED POLICE BATTALION, POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695010

4 KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM , PIN - 695004

BY SRI. P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, PSC  
BY SRI.B.UNNIKRISHNA KAIMAL, SR. GOVT. PLEADER

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME  
UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13.10.2022 ALONG WITH  
OP(KAT).NO.167/2022, THE COURT ON 17.10.2022 DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED NIAS C.P.

MONDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER 2022/25TH ASWINA, 1944

O.P(KAT).NO.167 OF 2022

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 18.05.2022 IN O.A.NO.1913/2020 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/APPLICANT IN OA:

- 1 AJITHKUMAR G  
AGED 30 YEARS  
VADAKKE ALAPPURATH HOUSE, CHERUVACKAL,  
SREEKARYAM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695017
  
- 2 NITHIN M. NAIR  
AGED 32 YEARS  
VELAVILA VEEDU, CHOOZHAMPALA, MUKKOLA P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695044

BY ADV.SRI.P.NANDAKUMAR  
BY ADV.SMT.AMRUTHA SANJEEV  
BY ADV.SRI.VIVEK VIJAYAKUMAR  
BY ADV.SMT.SHEMA ELIZABETH SCARIA

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN O.A.:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO  
GOVERNMENT, HOME DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM , PIN - 695001
  
- 2 THE STATE POLICE CHIEF

POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,  
PIN - 695010

3 THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE  
ARMED POLICE BATTALION, POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695010

4 KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695004

BY SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, PSC  
BY SRI.B.UNNIKRISHNA KAIMAL, SR. GOVT. PLEADER

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME  
UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13.10.2022 ALONG WITH  
OP(KAT).NO.162/2022, THE COURT ON 17.10.2022 DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:

'C.R.'

## J U D G M E N T

**A.K. Jayasankaran Nambiar, J.**

The applicants in O.A.(EKM) No.1913 of 2020 and O.A.(EKM) No.388 of 2021 before the Kerala Administrative Tribunal are the petitioners before us in these Original Petitions impugning the common order dated 18.5.2022 of the Tribunal in the O.A.'s aforementioned. The brief facts necessary for disposal of these Original Petitions are as follows:

The Kerala Public Service Commission [PSC] had issued a notification dated 10.3.2016 for selection to the post of Police Constable in the India Reserve Battalion (Regular Wing) of the Kerala Police Establishment. Pursuant to the selection process that ensued, a rank list of candidates was published by the PSC on 4.7.2018. Going by the provisions of the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13 of the Kerala Public Service Commission Rules of Procedure, the ranked list

was to remain in force for a period of one year therefrom or till one month from the date of commencement of the course in respect of the last batch selected from the list within a period of one year from the date of finalisation of the ranked lists, whichever was later. Admittedly, the last batch of candidates advised from the rank list within the one year period that expired by 3.7.2019, was on 10.6.2019. The training for the said batch of candidates who were advised on 10.6.2019 however commenced only on 5.8.2020, and hence, taking note of the provisions of the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13, the PSC cancelled the list on 4.9.2020. The case of the applicants before the Tribunal was essentially that 119 vacancies to the post in question had been reported to the PSC on 4.9.2020, and the PSC had advised persons to the said vacancies on 28.9.2020. They contended therefore that the PSC was obliged to extend the validity of the rank list by a further period up to one month after the last batch of those advised on 28.9.2020 commenced their training. As the training for the said last batch commenced only on 1.2.2021, it was their contention that the validity of the rank list had to be extended till 1.3.2021. It was their further case that inasmuch as the PSC had unilaterally extended the validity of all rank lists that had expired between the period from 5.2.2021 and 3.8.2021, up to 4.8.2021, their rank lists also had to be

extended till 4.8.2021.

2. The said argument did not find favour with the Tribunal, which proceeded to dismiss the O.A.'s on the reasoning detailed in paragraphs 27 to 30 of the order of the Tribunal, which is extracted herein below:

"27. The decision by the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.A.No.282/2008 and connected cases dated 15.10.2008 is distinguishable on facts. Therein, the ranked list for the post of Sub Inspector of Police (General Executive Branch) (Trainee) was published on 19.8.2006 and the one year period expired on 18.8.2007. Before the expiry of one year period, 16 vacancies were reported against which advices were issued on 21.8.2007 and their training commenced on 1.1.2008. The contention was that the ranked list would expire only with effect from 1.2.2008 and in the meanwhile certain promotion vacancies had arisen. 49 anticipated vacancies had been reported during the currency of the ranked list and since these vacancies had materialized on effecting promotions, advice was to be issued against the 39 vacancies occurred due to such promotion. The Public Service Commission took the stand that the one year period expired on 18.8.2007 and the advice issued on 21.08.2007 cannot be taken into account for reckoning the lifespan of the ranked list. The Division Bench held that the last batch of selected candidates during the currency of the list was sent for training only on 1.1.2008. It was held that there was no further selection, after the ranked list was prepared and the Public Service Commission was only to advise candidates from the ranked list according to the vacancies reported subject to the rules of reservation. The Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court directed the Public Service Commission to advise 39 candidates from the ranked list.

28. As noted herein before, the one year period of Annexure A2 ranked list was completed as on 3.7.2019. The advices issued on 28.9.2020 were against vacancies reported on 4.9.2020, i.e. after the expiry of the one year period. However, the Public Service Commission had found it fit to honour the above reporting so far as the reporting was on the date of expiry of the list, i.e. on 4.9.2020. The above advice and the commencement of training by the candidates so advised, cannot be reckoned for considering the date on which the ranked list ceased to exist in the light of the provisions under the first proviso to Rule 13.

29. The Full Bench of the Hon'ble High Court as per the decision in **Unnikrishnan Nair G.S. and Another v. State of Kerala and Others, 2019 (2) KHC 24** also analysed Rules 13 and 14 of the PSC Rules of Procedure. It was held that on a plain reading of Rule 13 it was clear that the ranked list would remain in force for a period of one year from the date on which it was brought into force and the said list would continue to be in force until the publication of a new list after the minimum period of one year or till the expiry of 3 years, whichever was earlier. The 1<sup>st</sup> proviso provides that the general rule would not apply to training courses that leads to automatic appointment to the posts and such ranked lists would cease to be in force after one year from the date of finalization of the ranked list or after one month from the date of commencement of the course in respect of the batch selected from the list within a period of one year from the date of finalization of the ranked list, whichever is later. It was held that the last advice of 339 candidates by the Public Service Commission, after adding the period during which the interim order interdicting advice and appointment from the list was in force, was in February 2014. The date of commencement of training by the above batch, was on 1.5.2016 and the ranked list, it was held, would therefore expire on 1.6.2016. The above finding by the Full Bench was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as per the decision in **Aneesh Kumar V.S. and Others v. State of Kerala and Others, 2020 (7) SCC 301**. The last advice within one year period from the ranked list was on 10.6.2019 and the above batch commenced its training on 5.8.2020 and the ranked list therefore ceased to exist with effect from 4.9.2020.

30. The contention of the applicants, that the one month from the date of commencement of training of the batch advised on 28.9.2020, i.e. 1.3.2021 is to be taken as the date of expiry of the list and that the 77 vacancies reported before the above date, i.e. on 1.10.2020, 1.11.2020 and 1.12.2020 (according to the second respondent) and on 13.1.2021 (according to the Public Service Commission) if accepted, would render the first proviso to Rule 13 of the PSC Rules of Procedure ineffective. In a hypothetical situation, when advices are issued against the above 77 vacancies, then if further vacancies were reported within one month of commencement of training course of these 77 candidates, then advices would have to be issued against those reported vacancies as well. This would be a never ending process which would defeat the very purpose of the first proviso to Rule 13. The contention of the applicants that the ranked list would expire only on 1.3.2021 cannot be countenanced. It is held that Annexure A2 ranked list has ceased to exist as on 4.9.2020."

3. Before us, it is the submission of Sri.P.Nandakumar, the learned counsel for the petitioners in these O.P's that in view of



Ext.P14 judgment of a Division Bench of this Court, the Special Leave Petition [SLP] against which was dismissed, the PSC was obliged to extend the validity of the rank lists till 4.8.2021, as was contended by the petitioners before the Tribunal. It is pointed out that after the dismissal of the SLP preferred by the State against Ext.P14 judgment, a Review Petition was filed before this Court, where, another Division Bench that considered the matter, directed four additional NJD vacancies also to be advised. The learned counsel for the petitioners also places reliance on the judgment dated 8.4.2016 of another Division Bench in O.P.(KAT).No.1 of 2015 that followed the ratio in Ext.P14 judgment relied on by him. It is further pointed out that the Tribunal itself had followed Ext.P14 judgment while disposing a similar O.A. [Ext.P15], and in pursuance of the Tribunal's order, the applicant in the said O.A. had been advised to the post by the PSC. The argument of the learned counsel, briefly, is that inasmuch as the PSC had advised persons to vacancies that had arisen prior to the cancellation of the list on 4.9.2020, and the last batch of the said advised candidates had commenced their training on 1.2.2021, the provisions of the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13 mandated that the validity of the rank list be extended further taking note of the commencement of training of the said candidates.

4. Per contra, it is the submission of Sri.P.C. Sasidharan, the learned Standing Counsel for the PSC that the expression “within a period of one year from the date of finalisation of the ranked lists”, that finds mention in the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13, cannot be ignored while determining the scope and extent of the provision. He points out that the intention of the provision was to permit an extension of the validity of the rank list for such period as would coincide with the expiry of one month from the date of commencement of the training course in respect of the last batch that was selected from the list within a period of one year from the date of finalisation of the rank list. He further submits that the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioners, if accepted, would result in the rank list being extended on each and every occasion where an advice is made by the PSC, of candidates from the rank list, and this would effectively result in the validity of the rank list being extended for periods in excess of what is contemplated under Rule 13.

5. We have considered the arguments of Sri.P. Nandakumar, the learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri.P.C. Sasidharan, the learned Standing Counsel for the PSC as also Sri.B. Unnikrishna

Kaimal, the senior learned Government Pleader for the official respondents of the State.

6. Inasmuch as the issue involved pertains to the interpretation of the provisions of Rule 13 of the Kerala Public Service Commission Rules of Procedure, we deem it appropriate to extract the relevant provision as it stood during the relevant time:

“13. The ranked lists published by the Commission shall remain in force for a period of one year from the date on which it was brought into force provided that the said list will continue to be in force till the publication of a new list after the expiry of the minimum period of one year or till the expiry of three years whichever is earlier:

Provided that the above rule shall not apply in respect of ranked lists of candidates for admission to Training Courses that leads to automatic appointment to Services or posts and that in such cases the ranked lists shall cease to be in force after one year from the date of finalisation of the ranked lists or after one month from the date of commencement of the course in respect of the last batch selected from the list within a period of one year from the date of finalisation of the ranked lists whichever is later. “

7. It is clear from a reading of the said provision that the rank list that was published by PSC in the instant case on 4.7.2018 would have, in the absence of any intervening circumstances, remained in force only till 3.7.2019 or till such date as falls one month after the last batch of candidates advised therefrom commenced their training. It is also a pre-condition for the extension of the validity of the list beyond

one year that the selection of the last batch of candidates from the list for commencement of training happens within a period of one year from the finalisation of the rank list. This, according to us, is the interpretation to be placed on the provisions of the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13. It is significant that this is the interpretation that has been recognised by a Full Bench of this Court in **Unnikrishnan Nair G.S. & Another v. State of Kerala & Others - [2019 (2) KLJ 152]**, which was affirmed by the Supreme Court in **Aneesh Kumar V.S. and Others v. State of Kerala and Others - [(2020) 7 SCC 301]**.

8. The claim of the petitioners before us is that the validity of the rank list must be extended by a further period up to the date that coincides with the expiry of one month after the last batch of persons advised under the extended period, under the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13, commenced their training. On the facts of the instant case this would mean that we have to look at the dates on which the last batch of candidates advised pursuant to the 119 vacancies reported on 4.9.2020, commenced their training, and then ascertain the date on which the period of one month therefrom expires. All vacancies reported till the said date would then have to be ascertained and candidates from the rank list advised to the said vacancies. We would

then, yet again, have to ascertain the date on which the last batch of those candidates commenced their training and so on. This contention of the petitioners is clearly untenable since, accepting the same would result in a never-ending process of extension of a rank list till all candidates in the list are advised to vacancies that are reported during the period of each extension. This could never have been the intention of the rule makers. We also find that an acceptance of the contention of the petitioners would render meaningless the phrase “within a period of one year from the date of finalisation of the ranked lists” that finds mention in the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13.

9. Before parting with this case, we might also observe that even in Ext.P14 judgment of the Division Bench of this Court, which was relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners to substantiate their contention with regard to the interpretation to be placed on the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13, the Division Bench did not say anything contrary to the interpretation that we have placed on the provision. In the said case, which also considered a process of selection to the post of Sub Inspector of Police in the Kerala Police establishment, the PSC had refused to advice candidates to vacancies reported before the expiry of the validity of the rank list, within the

extended period contemplated in the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13. The stand of the PSC in that case was that inasmuch as the normal period of one year had expired, advices could not be made to vacancies that had been reported after the expiry of the said period. It was the said contention that was repelled by the Division Bench, which found that the PSC was obliged to advice candidates against even those vacancies that had been reported during the extended period envisaged by the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13. In other words, all that the Division Bench said was that the vacancies reported after the period of one year and up to one month after the date of commencement of training of the last batch advised within the one year period, had also to be taken into account by the PSC for issuing advices. We do not doubt the correctness of the said judgment for, it accords with the view taken by us in this judgment as regards the interpretation to be placed on the provision. We find that the reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners on the said judgment, to advance the contention that the validity of the rank list in question would have to be extended by such further period as coincides with the expiry of one month from the date on which the last batch of candidates advised during the extended period under the 1<sup>st</sup> proviso to Rule 13 commenced their training, is wholly misplaced. We also do not feel that the Division

Bench in O.P.(KAT).No.1 of 2015 has taken a view contrary to our findings mentioned above. The Tribunal, in our view, has correctly appreciated the above judgment of the Division Bench while dismissing the O.A.'s.

In the result, we see no reason to interfere with the impugned order of the Tribunal, and for the reasons stated therein, as supplemented by the reasons in this judgment, the O.P.(KAT)'s are dismissed.

**Sd/-**  
**A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR**  
**JUDGE**

**Sd/-**  
**MOHAMMED NIAS C.P.**  
**JUDGE**

**prp/**

APPENDIX OF O.P (KAT) .NO.162/2022PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:

- AnnexureA1 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 10.03.2016 UNDER CAT. NO. 18/2016 ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE POST OF POLICE CONSTABLES, INDIA RESERVE BATTALION (REGULAR WING)
- AnnexureA3 ANNEXURE A3: TRUE COPY OF GO (MS) NO.48/2011/HOME DATED 18.02.2011
- AnnexureA2 ANNEXURE A2: TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST NO. 478/18 ER IX (2) 8142/16/EW DATED 04.07.2018 ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
- AnnexureA6 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.L7-82894/2020/PHQ DATED 31.07.2020 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Annexure3 ANNEXURE A3: TRUE COPY OF GO (MS) NO.48/2011/HOME DATED 18.02.2011
- AnnexureA9 TRUE COPY OF QUERY DATED 28.12.2020 SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND APPLICANT
- AnnexureA13 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO. BO22/2021/IRB DATED 28.01.2021 ISSUED BY THE COMMANDANT, IRB THRISSUR.
- AnnexureA4 ANNEXURE A4: TRUE COPY OF GO (MS) NO.130/2020/HOME DATED 18.06.2020
- AnnexureA5 ANNEXURE A5: TRUE COPY OF LETTER NO. L7-144548/2018/PHQ DATED 26.10.2018 SENT BY THE



2ND RESPONDENT TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT

ExhibitP11 TRUE COPY OF COMMON JUDGMENT DATED 02.08.2021 IN OP(KAT)NO.184 OF 2021 AND CONNECTED CASE

Annexure6 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.L7-82894/2020/PHQ DATED 31.07.2020 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT

AnnexureA7 TRUE COPY OF G.O(MS) NO. 92/2020/HOME DATED 23.04.2020 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT

AnnexureA8 TRUE COPY OF GO(MS) NO.150/2020/HOME DATED 04.09.2020 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT

Annexure9 TRUE COPY OF QUERY DATED 28.12.2020 SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND APPLICANT

AnnexureA10 TRUE COPY OF REPLY ISSUED AS PER LETTER NO.13(RTI)-1023/2021/PHQ DATED 27.01.2021 BY THE STATE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER ATTACHED TO THE OFFICE OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT

M.A to join together M.A TO JOIN TOGETHER

AnnexureR2 (a) A TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. R1A(3)8465/2018/GW DATED 13.11.2020 OF THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

AnnexureA11 TRUE COPY OF THE RTI QUERY DATED 10.09.2020 PREFERRED BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Annexure11 (a) TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 06.10.2020 ISSUED VIDE LETTER NO. 1579142/INFO.3/214/2020/FIN BY THE INFORMATION OFFICER ATTACHED TO THE OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

AnnexureA12 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. R1A(3)8465/2018/GW DATED 13.11.2020 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT

ExhibitP1 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 18.05.2022 IN OA (EKM) NO. 388 OF 2021

ExhibitP2 TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL APPLICATION ALONG WITH ANNEXURES

ExhibitP3 TRUE COPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 23.02.2021 IN OA NO. 1913 OF 2020

ExhibitP4 TRUE COPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 26.02.2021 IN OA(EKM) NO.388 OF 2021

ExhibitP5 TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED ON BEHALF OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 04.03.2021 ALONG WITH ANNEXURE

ExhibitP6 TRUE COPY OF MA(EKM)NO. 523 OF 2021 FILED BY RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3 DATED 08.03.2021 FOR VACATING INTERIM ORDER DATED 26.02.2021

ExhibitP7 TRUE COPY OF REJOINDER SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANTS DATED 11.03.2021 TO THE REPLY STATEMENT OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT ALONG WITH ANNEXURES

ExhibitP8 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 05.02.2021 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT.

ExhibitP9 TRUE COPY OF M.A(EKM)NO. 627 OF 2021 FOR AMENDMENT DATED 11.03.2021 ALONG WITH ANNEXURE

ExhibitP10 TRUE COPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 23.07.2021 IN M.A(EKM)NO. 523 OF 2021 AND CONNECTED

CASE

- Exhibit11 TRUE COPY OF COMMON JUDGMENT DATED 02.08.2021 IN OP(KAT)NO.184 OF 2021 AND CONNECTED CASE
- ExhibitP12 TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED ON BEHALF OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 15.03.2022
- ExhibitP13 TRUE COPY OF M.A (EKM)NO. 631 OF 2022 FOR PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENT DATED 26.03.2022 ALONG WITH ANNEXURE.
- ExhibitP14 TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 15.10.2008 IN W.A NO. 282 OF 2008 AND CONNECTED CASES
- ExhibitP15 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 11.11.2021 IN OA NO. 1424 OF 2020.
- ExhibitP16 TRUE COPY OF ADVISE MEMO DATED 28.04.2022 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO THE APPLICANT IN OA NO. 1424 OF 2021.

APPENDIX OF O.P(KAT) .NO.167/2022

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:

- AnnexureA1 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 10.03.2016 UNDER CAT. NO. 18/2016 ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE POST OF POLICE CONSTABLES, INDIA RESERVE BATTALION (REGULAR WING)
- AnnexureA2 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST NO. 478/18 ER IX (2) 8142/16/EW DATED 04.07.2018 ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
- AnnexureA3 TRUE COPY OF GO(MS) NO.48/2011/HOME DATED 18.02.2011
- AnnexureA4 TRUE COPY OF GO(MS) NO.130/2020/HOME DATED 18.06.2020
- AnnexureA5 TRUE COPY OF LETTER NO. L7-144548/2018/PHQ DATED 26.10.2018 SENT BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- AnnexureA6 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.L7-82894/2020/PHQ DATED 31.07.2020 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- AnnexureA7 TRUE COPY OF G.O(MS) NO. 92/2020/HOME DATED 23.04.2020 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- AnnexureA8 TRUE COPY OF GO(MS) NO.150/2020/HOME DATED 04.09.2020 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

MA to join together MA TO JOIN TOGETHER

AnnexureA9 TRUE COPY OF QUERY DATED 28.12.2020  
SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND APPLICANT

Annexure9 (a) TRUE COPY OF RTI REPLY DATED 09.02.2021  
ISSUED VIDE LETTER NO. G1-24952/2020/IRB BY  
THE INFORMATION OFFICER ATTACHED TO THE  
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDANT, INDIA RESERVE  
BATTALION

AnnexureA10 TRUE COPY OF THE RTI QUERY DATED 10.09.2020  
PREFERRED BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

AnnexureA10 (a) TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 06.10.2020  
ISSUED VIDE LETTER NO.  
1579142/INFO.3/214/2020/FIN BY THE  
INFORMATION OFFICER ATTACHED TO THE OFFICE  
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.

AnnexureMA1 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 13.11.2020  
OF THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

AnnexureA11 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO.  
R1A(3)8465/2018/GW DATED 13.11.2020 ISSUED  
BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT

ExhibitP1 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 18.05.2022 IN OA  
NO. 1913 OF 2020

ExhibitP2 TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL APPLICATION ALONG WITH  
ANNEXURES.

ExhibitP3 TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED ON BEHALF  
OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 25.01.2021.

ExhibitP4 TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED ON BEHALF  
OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 23.06.2021

ExhibitP5 TRUE COPY OF REJOINDER SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANTS DATED 11.02.2021 TO THE REPLY STATEMENT OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT ALONG WITH ANNEXURES

ExhibitP6 TRUE COPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 23.02.2021 IN OA NO. 1913 OF 2021

ExhibitP7 TRUE COPY OF MA NO. 780 OF 2021 FILED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 20.03.2021 FOR VACATING INTERIM ORDER DATED 23.02.2021.

ExhibitP8 TRUE COPY OF M.A NO. 821 OF 2021 FOR AMENDMENT DATED 22.03.2021 ALONG WITH ANNEXURE

ExhibitP9 TRUE COPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 23.07.2021 IN M.A (EKM) NO. 523 OF 2021 AND M.A NO. 780 OF 2021

ExhibitP10 TRUE COPY OF COMMON JUDGMENT DATED 02.08.2021 IN OP(KAT)NO.185 OF 2021 AND CONNECTED CASE.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE