



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.MANU

THURSDAY, THE 30TH DAY OF MAY 2024 / 9TH JYAISHTA, 1946

OP(KAT) NO. 215 OF 2023

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 09.02.2023 IN OA NO.487 OF
2021 OF KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

SIJO THOMAS,
AGED 36 YEARS

S/O THOMAS
NOW WORKING AS BEAT FOREST OFFICER, NORTH
DIVISION, MANANATHAVADY RANGE, WAYANAD-, RESIDING
AT PARAKAL, KUNNAMANGALAM.P.O, WAYANAD, KERALA,
PIN - 670645

BY ADVS.
REKHA VASUDEVAN
ELIZABETH V.JOSEPH
ROJIT ZACHARIAH

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FOREST
AND WILD LIFE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN -
695001
- 2 PRINCIPAL CHIEF FOREST CONSERVATOR
AND CHIEF WILD LIFE WARDEN, FOREST HEADQUARTERS,
VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN -
695014
- 3 THE SECRETARY, KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695004



- 4 ARUN KUMAR K (RANK NO.9)
BEAT FOREST OFFICER, VADASSERIKKARA RANGE,
GURUNATHAN MANNU FOREST STATION, PATHANAMTHITTA-
689699, KERALA, PIN - 689699
- 5 VIJAY KUMAR B (RANK NO.76)
BEAT FOREST OFFICER, RANNI FOREST RANGE,
RAJAMPARA FOREST STATION, PATHANAMTHITTA ,
KERALA, PIN - 689662
- 6 JINESH.K.P
KANDANGAPURATHU HOUSE, KARULAI, MALAPPURAM,
KERALA., PIN - 679344
- 7 PRAVEEN.R.S
PREETHA BHAVAN, PUNNAMKONAM, KACHANI,
NETTAYAM.P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN -
695013
- 8 SANOJ.S
VATHIS SERIL VEEDU, POROOKKARA, EDAPPALLY KOTTA,
KOLLAM, KERALA, PIN - 691583
- 9 ANANTHAPADMANABHAN
K.K.HOUSE, PIUS NAGAR.P.O, IDUKKI-685620,
KERALA., PIN - 685620
- 10 BIJU.S
THANUVELIL VADACKETHIL, ULAQVACKAD, NOORNAD,
ALAPPUZHA, KERALA., PIN - 690504
- 11 RATHEESH.P.D
PARAPPUKARAN HOUSE, ELAMTHURUTHY, KUTTANELLUR,
THRISSUR-680014, KERALA., PIN - 680014
- 12 RENJITH.G.S
SREENILAYAM, CHERUKUNNAM, ANAYADI POST,
PATHANAMTHITTA, KERALA., PIN - 690561
- 13 MUHAMMED ALI JINNA.S
POLLACHI HOUSE, PUTHUPALLI STREET, PUTHUNAGARAM,
PALAKKAD, KERALA., PIN - 678503
- 14 SHIJU.N
SIBLE MANDIRAM PADAPPAKARA, PADAPPAKARA, KOLLAM,
KERALA., PIN - 691503



- 15 SANOOKRISHNAN.P.V
KRISHNA NIVAS, XVI/305,PEROOL SOUTH, M.M.BAZAR,
KANNUR, KERALA., PIN - 670306
- 16 SANTHOSH KUMAR.G
G.S.BHAVAN, KARINGANNOOR.P.O, KOLLAM-691516,
KERALA., PIN - 691516
- 17 FRANCIS M YOHANAN
MALIAKAL HOUSE, THEKKADY.P.O, THEKKADY, IDUKKI,
KERALA., PIN - 685509
- 18 PREJI A.C
MANALIL PUTHUVAL PUTHEN VEEDU, KAZHIVOOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695526
- 19 SHEREEF.P
PANOLAN HOUSE, KARULAI, MALAPPURAM, KERALA, PIN -
679330
- 20 PRAKASH.L
FATHIMA MANDIRAM, SINKARAPPALLY, KODUVILA.P.O,
KOLLAM, KERALA, PIN - 691502
- 21 SANJAY KUMAR.I.P
IRIKKAPALLIYALIL, VADAKKUMPURAM, MALAPPURAM,
KERALA., PIN - 676552
- 22 MANU K NAIR
LAKSHMI NILAYAM HOUSE, MANAKKADU.P.O, IDUKKI,
KERALA., PIN - 685584
- 23 BINOJ.P.R
PUTHETTUKUNNEL HOUSE, MANJOOR.P.O, KOTTAYAM,
KERALA., PIN - 686603
- 24 SHAIK RASHEED.K.M
KAINIKKAPARAMBIL HOUSE, CHELAKKARA,
PANGARAPPILLY, THRISSUR, KERALA., PIN - 680586
- 25 SHUHAIB.V.S
KOCHU VEEDU, PUNNALA, PUNNALA.P.O, KOLLAM., PIN -
689706
- 26 ASHIK BASHEER
BISMI MANZIL, PONKUNNAM, KOTTAYAM, KERA, PIN -
686506



- 27 VIMAL.P
PANNIKOTTIL HOUSE, AMARAMBALAM SOUTH.P.O,
MALAPPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 679339
- 28 VISHNU.V.S
KRISHNA CHARAPARAMBU, KODUNT HIRAPULLY, PALAKKAD,
KERALA., PIN - 678004
- 29 SANOO.P.K.C
KOOthoor HOUSE, CHELAKKARA, THRISSUR, KERALA, PIN
- 680586
- 30 SHIBUKUTTAN.A.T
ARESSERIL, ARTHUNKAL, CHERTHALA, ARTHUNKAL,
ALAPPUZHA, KERALA., PIN - 688530
- 31 ANEESH G.R
JANARDHANAVILASAM, KADAMPATTUKONAM, KOLLAM,
KERALA., PIN - 691574
- 32 RAMACHANDRAN.A.K
ARIKKAT HOUSE, ITHUPPADAM MATTATHUR, THRISSUR,
KERALA., PIN - 680684
- 33 ARUN.P.A
PULINJOTTIL VEEDU, EZHIKKARA, EZHIKKARA.P.O,
ERNAKULAM, KERALA., PIN - 683513
- 34 MANU.M.S
MUDAS SERIL KANAYANNUR, CHOTTANIKKARA, ERNAKULAM,
KERALA., PIN - 682312
- 35 RASESH.T.N
THACHIPARAMBIL HOUSE, KAVILKADAVU, KODUNGALLUR,
THRISSUR, KERALA., PIN - 680664

BY ADVS.

SRI.A.T.VARGHESE SR.G.P.

PRASANTH SUGATHAN

VARSHA BHASKAR(K/487/2004)

ANUPAMA SIBI(K/698/2019)

N.KRISHNA OZHAKKANAT(K/1518/2019)

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME UP
FOR ADMISSION ON 21.05.2024, THE COURT ON 30.05.2024
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



O.P.(KAT)No.215 of 2023

5

[CR]

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE & S.MANU, JJ.-----
O.P.(KAT)No.215 of 2023
-----Dated this the 30th day of May, 2024**JUDGMENT****S.MANU, J.**

The petitioner is the applicant in O.A.No.487 of 2021 of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (KAT), Thiruvananthapuram. He is challenging the final order dated 9.2.2023 passed by the KAT by which the original application was dismissed.

2. The issue involved in the case relates to the transfer/recruitment from in-service candidates to the post of Range Forest Officers in the Forest and Wildlife Department. In the O.A. the petitioner stated that he is working as Beat Forest Officer. He joined duty on 20.10.2011. As on the date of filing the O.A. the petitioner was aged 34 years and claimed to have qualifying service of 9 years, 4 months and 16 days.

3. By Annexure-A4 notification dated 30.8.2016 of the Kerala Public Service Commission (KPSC) seven vacancies of Range Forest Officers were notified for recruitment by transfer from Forest Officers, namely, Wildlife Assistant, Deputy Ranger,



Forester and Beat Forest Officer. It has been clearly stated in the notification that the number of vacancies mentioned are provisional, subject to change according to the allotment of seats by the Director of Forestry Education, Ministry of Forests and Environment, Government of India and due to arising of more vacancies. A note below the column showing the number of vacancies is included which is re-produced hereunder:-

“Note: The Ranked List of candidates published by the Kerala Public Service Commission in pursuance of this notification shall cease to be in force after one month from the date of commencement of training (Forest Range Officers Course) or 3 months from the date of coming into force of the ranked list whichever is later.”

4. The Special Rule for the Kerala Forest service prescribes the qualification for appointment to the post of Range Forest Officer by transfer. As shown in Annexure-A4, for seeking appointment by transfer, the candidate should have minimum 5 years service in the feeder category post. The maximum age limit stipulated is 40.

5. The petitioner admittedly had not completed 5 years service in the feeder category when Annexure-A4 was issued.



O.P.(KAT)No.215 of 2023

7

Therefore, he was not eligible to apply for appointment when the recruitment process commenced pursuant to Annexure-A4 notification. The petitioner filed O.A.No.487/2021 before the KAT in July, 2021 after Annexure-A6 ranked list came into force on 28.1.2021. Thus, it clearly emerges that the petitioner was not eligible to take part in the selection process pursuant to Annexure-A4 and that he raised no challenge against Annexure-A4 till the process was completed and the ranked list came into force. It is also to be noted that, though the ranked list came into force on 28.1.2021, the O.A. was filed much later in July, 2021. It is pertinent to note that the short list was published much earlier, on 02.11.2017.

6. The following reliefs are sought in the O.A.:-

- i) *To declare that the provision in Annexure A4 notification that the seven notified vacancies are provisional and subject to change due to arising of more vacancies is illegal and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.*
- ii) *To direct the 3rd respondent to fill up only seven vacancies notified in Annexure A4 notification*



from Annexure A6 rank list and to issue fresh notification for all the vacancies set apart and reported for by Transfer recruitment after Annexure A4 notification in accordance with Rule 13 of Kerala Public Service Commission Rules of Procedure.

ii(a) To set aside the appointment of respondents 6 to 35 as Range Forest Officers from Annexure A6 rank list.

iii) Issue such other directions or orders as this Honourable Tribunal deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice."

7. The Government, PSC and the party respondents filed separate reply statements in the O.A. In the reply statement of the Department it was contended that the O.A. has been filed without proper understanding of the Rules and Procedures followed by the PSC and that the contentions of the applicant are untenable. In the reply statement filed by the PSC it was stated that the ranked list for the post of Range Forest Officer was published with effect from 28.1.2021 and a total number of 40



O.P.(KAT)No.215 of 2023

9

candidates were advised on 24.2.2021, 29.6.2021 and 21.12.2021. Referring to the second proviso to Rule 13 of the Public Service Commission Rules of Procedure, 1976 the PSC pointed out that the ranked list will be in force only for a period of three months from the date of finalisation of the ranked list or one month from the date of commencement of the training course whichever is later. It was further stated that the validity period of Annexure-A6 ranked list expired on 27.4.2021 as it crossed three months and the training of the candidates had started on 9.8.2021, 16.8.2021 and 27.9.2021. The Commission refuted the contention regarding cut off mark and inclusion of candidates in multiples of vacancies notified in the ranked list. The party respondents in their reply statement specifically contended that the applicant has no locus standi to maintain the O.A. Apart from disputing every contention in the O.A. they relied on Rule 14 of the PSC Rules of Procedure. It is the case of the respondents that in view of Rule 14, all the vacancies notified as well as arising during the currency of the list shall be filled up by appointment of the candidates included in the list. They relied on the judgments of this Court reported in **Jyothish Kumar v.**



State of Kerala [1996 (2) KLT 444] and **Sebastian P.Joseph v. K.S.R.T.C.** [1998 (2) KLT 846].

8. The learned Tribunal, on completion of the pleadings heard the respective counsel for the parties and passed the impugned order. The Tribunal noted that the applicant who was not eligible as on the date of issuance of Annexure-A4 notification cannot be permitted to challenge the filling up of available vacancies from the ranked list published pursuant to Annexure-A4 notification. The Tribunal relied on Rule 14 of the PSC Rules of Procedure and finally rejected the O.A.

9. Before us Smt.Rekha Vasudevan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, vehemently contended that the law is well settled that appointments beyond the number of vacancies notified would be illegal. She referred to the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Rakhi Ray and others v. High Court of Delhi and others** [2010 KHC 4079] and also in **Anurag Kumar Singh and others v. State of Uttarakhand and others** [2016 KHC 6665]. She further submitted that the filling up of more vacancies than notified under Annexure-A4 has adversely affected the prospects of the



petitioner as well as many others who became eligible after the date of notification. She asserted that filling up of vacancies beyond the 7 vacancies specifically mentioned in Annexure-A4 is unconstitutional and the learned Tribunal faulted in dismissing the O.A. On the other hand, Sri.Prasanth Sugathan appearing for the party respondents argued that the petitioner who was not eligible to apply in response to Annexure-A4 notification is not entitled to maintain the original petition and the O.A. itself was an abuse of the process of the court. He referred to the provisions of the PSC Rules of Procedure, specifically highlighting Rule 14 and submitted that in view of the specific provision in the Rules of Procedure of the Kerala Public Service Commission the general principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgments cited by the learned counsel for the petitioner cannot have application to the recruitment in question. The learned Government Pleader also opposed the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner has no locus standi to maintain this original petition. The learned Government Pleader further submitted that the order passed by the learned Tribunal is perfectly legal and does



not warrant any interference by this Court in exercise of the supervisory jurisdiction.

10. We have perused the original petition, order impugned as also the documents produced apart from elaborately hearing the counsel appearing for either side.

11. We find that the petitioner was not admittedly eligible to seek appointment pursuant to Annexure-A4 notification. Therefore, the challenge to the recruitment process at his instance is not legally tenable. The petitioner cannot impugn the selection process unless he had a right at least to participate in the same. We also note that the O.A. was filed much after the ranked list was published. In the O.A., the petitioner challenged Annexure-A4. As Annexure-A4 is dated 30.8.2016, the said challenge was highly belated. Raising a challenge against a notification, which was issued more than 5 years ago and that too after the selection process culminated, can be considered only as a highly belated experimental litigation. Hence, the O.P. is liable to be dismissed for these reasons without entering into the merits of the case. However, since the O.P. was admitted and the respective counsel were heard elaborately we proceed to



analyse the merits of the contentions also.

12. As noted above, the prime contention raised by the petitioner is that filling up of vacancies over and above the specific number of vacancies notified is illegal. A close reading of the notification shows that it cannot be considered as a notification issued only for filling up seven vacancies. It is clearly mentioned in the notification that the number is provisional, subject to change. Hence the number given was only tentative. It cannot be compared with notifications issued for specific number of vacancies. Whether such a method is permissible is the next issue. Rule 14 of the PSC Rules of Procedure provides that the Commission shall advise candidates for all the vacancies reported and pending before them and the vacancies which may be reported to them for the period during which the ranked lists are kept alive. In view of the said provision, the PSC cannot be held to have committed any illegality in issuing the notification in such a fashion. None of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court cited by the learned counsel for the petitioner pertains to a selection process undertaken by the Kerala Public Service Commission in accordance with the PSC Rules of Procedure.



13. It is trite law that circumstantial flexibility, one additional or different fact may make a world of difference between conclusions in two cases. Disposal of cases by blindly placing reliance on a decision without proper analysis of factual matrices involved in the precedent and the case arising for consideration is not proper. In the present case the clear recital in the notification that the vacancies mentioned are tentative and the applicability of Rule 14 of the PSC Rules of Procedure make a glaring difference in the factual backdrop and the law laid down in the judgments cited by the learned counsel for the petitioner cannot be applied in the facts of the case.

14. In **Annie v. Commissioner, Chalakudy Municipality and others** [1984 KLT 170] a learned Single Judge of this Court analysed the provisions of Rules 13 and 14 of the said Rules and held as follows:-

"10. It is perhaps possible to contend that this part of R.14 in a way conflicts with the sweep of R.13. But, the conflict, if any, is not irreconcilable. The two rules can be interpreted harmoniously so as not to render either rule impotent or otiose. R.13 must be read subject to R.14. In other words, excepting in contingencies as contemplated in R.14, a ranked list published by the



Service Commission shall have life only during the period contemplated in R.13; or in other words, notwithstanding the lapse of the period of the ranked list as per R.13, the ranked list could be utilised for the limited purpose of advising candidates in relation to vacancies reported to the Service Commission before the lapse of the ranked list. The same idea could be conveyed by stating that at the expiry of the period of a ranked list as contemplated in R.13, what lapses is the ranked list except to the extent of the persons who are to be advised in accordance with the vacancies which may be reported to Service Commission before the lapse of the ranked list. This is the only rational and reasonable way of understanding R.13 and 14 of the Rules. If that be so there was nothing wrong in the Service Commission advising candidates even after the lapse of the ranked list in relation to vacancies reported to them before the lapse of the ranked list. This is the view taken by Khalid, J. (as he then was) in C Murughan and others v. State of Kerala and others ((1982(2) ILR. (Kerala) Page 74) and I am in respectful agreement with the same. Petitioners' challenge against the advice by the Service Commission and the contemplated appointments must necessarily fail."

15. We note that a Full Bench of this Court, in **Unnikrishnan Nair v. State of Kerala** [2019 (1) KLT 896



(F.B.)], has relied on the above view of the learned Single Judge.

16. Later, in **Jyothish Kumar v. State of Kerala** [1996 (2) KLT 444] this Court considered a case arising from similar notification wherein a similar note was included after stating the number of vacancies to the effect that the vacancies that are to arise till the expiry of the list shall also be filled up from the list. Referring to Rule 14, the learned Single Judge held that the specific provision in the PSC Rules of Procedure and also the clear statement in the recruitment notification permits filling up of vacancies beyond the number specifically stated in the notification and the same will not offend Articles 14 or 16 of the Constitution. Recently, a Division Bench of this Court, in **Shalu Varghese v. State of Kerala** [2023 KHC OnLine 727] noted the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and the distinct position in the rules of procedure regulating selections by Kerala PSC, in view of the provisions contained in Rules 13 and 14 of the Rules of Procedure.

17. The general principle that filling up of vacancies, more than that has been notified is illegal cannot be applied in the facts of the case at hand, in view of the above discussion. In



Annexure-A4 there is specific statement that vacancies anticipated during the currency of the ranked list will also be filled up from the same. Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure enables the Public Service Commission to adopt such a course and to fill up vacancies arising during the currency of the ranked list.

18. The petitioner has raised a challenge against Rule 14 in this original petition. However, we note that such a relief was not sought in the O.A. We are mindful of the jurisdiction we exercise in this case. In **Estralla Rubber v. Dass Estate (Pvt.) Ltd** [(2001) 8 SCC 97], the Hon'ble Apex Court held thus;

"The scope and ambit of exercise of power and jurisdiction by a High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is examined and explained in number of decisions of this Court. The exercise of power under this Article involves a duty on the High Court to keep inferior courts and tribunals within the bounds of their authority and to see that they do duty expected or required by them in a legal manner. The High Court is not vested with any unlimited prerogative to correct all kinds of hardship or wrong decisions made within the limits of the jurisdiction of the courts subordinate or tribunals. Exercise of this power and interfering



with the orders of the courts or tribunal is restricted to cases of serious dereliction of duty and flagrant violation of fundamental principles of law or justice, where if High Court does not interfere, a grave injustice remains uncorrected. It is also well settled that the High Court while acting under this Article cannot exercise its power as an appellate court or substitute its own judgment in place of that of the subordinate court to correct an error, which is not apparent on the fact of the record. The High Court can set aside or ignore the findings of facts of inferior court or tribunal, if there is no evidence at all to justify or the finding is so perverse, that no reasonable person can possibly come to such a conclusion, which the court or Tribunal has come to.”

Hence, in exercise of the jurisdiction under Article 227, we cannot proceed to enlarge the scope of the litigation by considering challenges which were not raised before the Tribunal.

19. A Division Bench of this Court, in the judgment reported in **T.Vijayakumar & others v. State of Kerala represented by the Secretary to Government, Animal Husbandry Department & others** [2014 (1) KLT 186] clarified that the visitorial jurisdiction under Article 227 of the



Constitution of India cannot be extended to widen the scope of an original petition to include reliefs not claimed and grounds not raised before the Tribunal. Therefore, we cannot entertain the challenge against Rule 14 in this original petition and as long as the said Rule remains in force, we cannot find fault with the official respondents in filling up vacancies which arose during the currency of the ranked list.

Hence, we conclude that the OP (KAT) only to be dismissed.

We do so.

Sd/-

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE, JUDGE

Sd/-

S.MANU, JUDGE

skj

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) 215/2023

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES

- Annexure-A1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER REGARDING THE JOINING OF THE APPLICANT VIDE NO. 70/2011 DATED 20.10.2011
- Annexure-A2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE SPECIAL RULES FOR THE KERALA FOREST SERVICE 2010 NOTIFIED VIDE G.O.(P) NO. 73/2010/F&WLD DATED 21.10.2010
- Annexure-A3 THE TRUE COPY OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE KERALA FOREST SERVICE SPECIAL RULES 2010 NOTIFIED VIDE G.O (P) NO. 80/2014/F&WLD DATED 10.09.2014
- Annexure-A4 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 30.08.2016 INVITING APPLICATIONS FOR BY TRANSFER RECRUITMENT TO THE POST OF RANGE FOREST OFFICERS VIDE CATEGORY NO. 213/2016 ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
- Annexure-A5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST PUBLISHED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION VIDE SL NO. 185/2017/ER IX DATED 02.11.2017 IN CATEGORY NO. 213/2016
- Annexure-A6 THE TRUE COPY OF RANKED LIST NO. 40/2021/SS VI WHICH CAME INTO FORCE W.E.F. 28.01.2021 FOR THE POST OF RANGE FOREST OFFICERS
- Annexure-A7 THE TRUE COPY OF THE SAID REPRESENTATION DATED 07.12.2020 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER / APPLICANT TO THE CHAIRMAN, KPSC, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- Annexure-A8 THE TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL RECEIPTS OF SUBMISSION OF ANNEXURE A7 AND REPRESENTATIONS TO THE 1ST AND 2ND RESPONDENTS DATED 11.12.2020
- Annexure-A9 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT CHART



NOTIFIED BY PSC IN CATEGORY NO. 213/2016
VIDE NO. RIA (3)10557/2015/GW DATED
24.02.2021 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT

- Annexure-A10** TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. 4-867/TRG.II/DFT-2021/1092-96 DATED 9-7-2021 ISSUED FROM THE DIRECTOR, FOREST EDUCATION TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT ALLOTING 17 SEATS AT FOREST TRAINING INSTITUTE AND RANGER COURSE, SUNDERNAGAR
- Annexure-A11** TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. 4-867/TRG.II/DFT-2021/1182-86 DATED 16-7-2021 ISSUED FROM THE DIRECTOR, FOREST EDUCATION TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT ALLOTING 19 SEATS AT KUNDAL ACADEMY OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT
- Annexure-A12** TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. 4-867/TRG.II/DFT-2021/1205-09 DATED 16-7-2021 ISSUED FROM THE DIRECTOR, FOREST EDUCATION TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT ALLOTING 17 SEATS AT CENTRAL ACADEMY FOR STATE FOREST SERVICE, ASSAM
- Exhibit-P1** THE TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN O.A. NO. 487/2021 ON THE FILE OF THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL DATED 9-2-2023
- Exhibit-P2** THE TRUE COPY OF THE O.A NO. 487 / 2021 FILED BY THE PETITIONER / APPLICANT
- Exhibit-P3** TRUE COPY OF THE M.A 1567/2021 FILED ALONG WITH ANNEXURE-A10-A12 DATED 9-8-2021
- Exhibit-P4** TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 24-3-2022
- Exhibit-P5** TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT DATED 19-8-2022
- Exhibit-P6** TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT DATED 5-1-2023
- Exhibit-P7** TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER DATED 1-10-2022 FILED BY THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit P8** TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.



KFDHQ/996/2024-ADMIN/D1 DATED 09.02.2024
ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT

Exhibit P9 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.
KFDHQ/996/2024-ADMIN/D1 DATED 15.02.2024
ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS

Exhibit R4(a) True copy of the notification dated 15-
12-2022 for category No. 515/2022 issued
by the 3rd respondent

Exhibit R4 (b) True copy of reply No. IDS-
II(4)/4669/2023/GW dated 19-10-2023 sent
by the State Public Information Officer
of the 3rd respondent to Sri.Raveendran
Nair