

From:

**Swatantra Singh, HJS**  
Registrar General,  
High Court of Judicature at  
Allahabad.

To,

**All the District & Sessions Judges**  
Subordinate to the High Court of Judicature at  
Allahabad.

**No. PS(RG)/167/2007 Dated: Allahabad: August 24, 2007**

Subject: **Report, decision taken on various representations regarding inter-se seniority along with final seniority list of the Officers in the Uttar Pradesh Higher Judicial Service.**

*Sir,*

I am directed to say that upon consideration of the matter dealing with inter-se seniority of the officers in the Uttar Pradesh Higher Judicial Service, in its entirety, as well various representations received in the matter, the Hon'ble Court has been pleased to finalize the inter-se seniority of the officers in the Uttar Pradesh Higher Judicial Service. The Hon'ble Seniority Committee report alongwith decision on various representations in the matter and final seniority list of the Officers in the Uttar Pradesh Higher Judicial Service, is available on Court's website ([www.allahabadhighcourt.in](http://www.allahabadhighcourt.in)).

You are therefore, requested to kindly inform all officers in the judiciary under your administrative control as well on deputation in the district. You are also requested to visit the site, download the report; decision on the representations and the final seniority list and circulate the same amongst all concerned in the district under intimation to this Court by communication addressed to the Registrar (Confidential), High Court of Judicature at Allahabad.

**This be treated as most instantaneous.**

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/-  
**(Swatantra Singh)**

**Report of the Higher Judicial Service Seniority Committee of Hon'ble Dr. Justice B.S. Chauhan, Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.K. Agarwal, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sunil Ambwani, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhushan & Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.S. Kulshrestha**

The Committee was appointed by Hon'ble the Chief Justice to determine the seniority of the officers of the Higher Judicial Service, U.P.

The last seniority list was finalized by the Seniority Committee of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal, Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.K. Khanna, Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.N. Khare, Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.P. Mishra and Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.K. Birla (referred to as Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee). The report dated 29.04.1992 with seniority list, also decided individual objections. Since, thereafter for various reasons the seniority list could not be finalized.

Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee finalized the seniority of 597 officers. Ten officers appointed subsequently from bar were excluded from the list for the reason that the allocation of substantive posts against their appointments was not feasible as the appointment of promotees of 1988 batch was awaited from Government. It was observed in the report that the seniority list of such officers, shall be determined after the appointment of direct recruitment of 1988 batch. The Committee reported, *"the ten direct recruits of 1984 batch, since they were appointed much subsequently, have not been included in List-B because their seniority, vis-à-vis promotees from U.P. Nyayik Sewa, can be fixed only when such promotees, who are officiating since before have been brought in their quota in the list."*

Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee fixed the seniority in accordance with the law laid down and directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court in O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 SC 1202 (hereafter referred to as O.P. Garg's case). The final seniority list dated 06.05.1992 drawn in pursuance of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee report was challenged by Shri K.N. Singh & others in writ petition No. 33297 of 1992 at Lucknow Bench of this Court. The Division Bench referred the matter to the Full Bench. Shri J.C. Gupta and Shri P.K. Jain, the direct recruits to HJS (before their elevation) also challenged the list in Writ Petition No. 30834 of 1992. A five Judges Bench of this Court heard the matter and dismissed both the writ petitions on 12.1.1999. The judgement is reported as **K.N. Singh & Ors. Vs. State of U.P. & Ors.** in **1999 Allahabad Law Journal 472**. A special leave petition against the judgement was dismissed by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

In **Ram Kishore Gupta Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1999 SC 2961** the Supreme Court considering the Full Bench judgement of this Court in the matter relating to allocation of vacancies to direct recruits held that in determining 15% ceiling of the direct recruit only permanent post in the cadre will be taken into consideration. According to Full Bench judgment in the recruitment of 1984 in the

quota for direct recruitment from Bar only 6 out of 10 selected candidates could be given appointment. The Supreme Court set aside the judgement of the High Court and upheld the appointment of four other direct recruits also, and observed that for their seniority, the proper course for the High Court is to determine the seniority of these persons on its administrative side. In doing so, the High Court will have to prepare, circulate, notify objections and finalize seniority of these persons in the light of law and decision of Supreme Court in O.P. Garg's case including the decision given in that case as well as interim orders made by the Court in pursuance of which appointment of four persons were made. A judgement in **Srikant Tripathi & Ors Vs. State of U.P. & Ors, AIR 2001 SC 3757** intervened. In this case a dispute between direct recruits and promotees in the cadre of U.P. Higher Judicial Service comprising of posts borne in Class-I U.P. Higher Judicial Service Rules, 1975 was under consideration. This case decided the issue of determination of vacancies. The Supreme Court gave a detailed directions in para 38 of the report regarding the determination of vacancies and the steps to be taken to fill up such vacancies.

The U.P. Judicial Service Association challenged the determination of vacancies made by the High Court in pursuance of Srikant Tripathi's case. In this writ petition No. 316 of 2004 a Division Bench of this Court quashed the determination made by the Full Court on 01.2.2004 and gave certain directions for re-determination of vacancies. In a special leave petition against this judgement notices have been issued and the matter is pending for final hearing.

In the aforesaid background the Committee is called upon to decide the seniority of the officers in Higher Judicial Service and to draw a final seniority list, after inviting and deciding the objections.

In its first meeting dated 03.06.2006 the Committee considered the issues relating to the determination of seniority and directed the registry to undertake an exercise to provide details regarding vacancies, to be allotted to the members of the Judicial Officers cadre; the placement of the ten recruits in the gradation list in respect of whom Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee had observed that their placement in the gradation list shall be considered at a later stage; and allocation of each and every vacancy after 1984 batch showing the names of the officers, who held the post as also the officers to whom the vacancies are proposed to be allotted. The Committee then held its meetings on 08.07.2006; and on 03.08.2006 the Committee resolved that a Tentative Seniority List (TSL) drawn by the registry be circulated inviting objections from all the officers, if they so desire. In the meeting dated 09.09.2006 the objections were directed to be compiled and classified.

In the next meeting on 18.09.2006 it was reported that some of the officers were transferred to the State of Uttaranchal after reorganization of the State in the year 2000-01. Their names find place in TSL and that any determination of their seniority may affect their rights. The Committee directed the TSL to be circulated amongst those officers as well, inviting objections. On 23.09.2006 directions were given to allocate some of the vacancies, which were left out by the registry in respect of four vacancies on account of leave and deputation reserve. In the next meeting on 14.10.2006 the Committee took notice of the representations received from U.P. Judicial Officers Association through its President Shri S.K. Tripathi, requesting permission for oral hearing. The Committee resolved to give a representative hearing to both the officers promoted from U.P. Nyayik Sewa and appointed by direct recruitment. Five representatives of their association were permitted to appear with spokesperson of each side to address the Committee. On 31.10.2006 the Committee heard the representatives of both the promotees and the direct recruits. Shri S.K. Tripathi for promotees and Shri Vishnu Chandra Gupta for direct recruits addressed the Committee at length. Sri U.C. Tiwari also appeared before the Committee and placed his submissions.

The Committee then met on 14.12.2006 and 19.12.2006 and deliberated over the matter. The Committee identified the issues and resolves them as follows:

**Issue No.1. Whether the Seniority Committee should treat the matters for fixing seniority in the report of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D.Agarwal's Committee as final, except the determination of seniority of 10 direct recruits left open?**

The Committee found that the principles adopted by Justice S.D.Agarwal's Committee have become final in view of five judges' decision of this Court in K.N.Singh's case affirming the seniority list, and decides to adopt the same principles, except the determination of seniority of 10 direct recruits left open for which for which Justice S.D.Agarwal's Committee had deferred the issue of settlement of their seniority including the allocation of vacancies for 10 direct recruits.

**Issue No.2. Whether the promotees are entitled to seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancy in their quota provided they are officiating on the date, irrespective of the date of the officiation?**

The Committee finds that this issue has been decided in O.P. Garg's case and was followed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee. The promotees are entitled to seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancies in their quota provided they were officiating on the date, irrespective of the date of their officiation in any capacity subject to condition that they are approved by Full Court for promotion under Rule 22(1) of the U.P.Higher Judicial Service Rules, 1975. This position shall, however, apply to only those promotees, who were promoted before

the amendment (15<sup>th</sup> March, 1996) of Rule 26 of the U.P. Higher Judicial Service Rules, 1975. The seniority of the officers promoted after March 15<sup>th</sup> 1996, will be determined in accordance with the amended rules.

**Issue No.3. Whether the seniority of the direct recruits should be determined from the date of joining in service?**

This issue was considered in O. P. Garg's case. Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee decided to follow the judgment to provide seniority of direct recruits from the date of their joining in service. The Committee found that some of the direct recruits were not allowed to join on account of interim orders passed by the Court. In all such cases, where appointments were restrained by the order of the Court, the direct recruit will be entitled to seniority from the date of passing of the restraint order. The Committee also noticed that Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee had by its decision dated 27.4.1992 decided the objections of Shri V.K.Jain, a direct recruit of 1976 batch and had given this benefit to him. The appointment of Shri Jain, a direct recruit to the service was restrained by a stay order passed by the Court on 7.4.1978. The representation of Shri Jain was allowed and he was given seniority w.e.f. 7.4.1976. The Committee resolves to adopt the same principle.

**Issue No. 4 Whether the Judgment in O. P. Garg's case, giving quota to the direct recruits in temporary vacancies also should be applied prospectively i.e. from the date of judgement in O. P. Garg's case?**

The Judgement in O. P. Garg's case had interpreted Rules of 1975 and has declared the Law. There was no direction in the Judgement that it will be applied prospectively. Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee applied the judgement in O. P. Garg case retrospectively. This Committee also resolves accordingly.

**Issue No.5. Whether the direct recruits are entitled for their quota in the temporary vacancies only after the amendment made in U.P. H.J.Rules, 1996 w.e.f. 15.3.96?**

The promotees officers in their representation as well as in oral hearing has submitted that the quota of the direct recruits in the temporary vacancies be given only with effect from amendment in U.P.Higher Judicial Service Rules, 1975 that is w.e.f. 15.3.1996. Shri S.K. Tripathi submitted that the Rule 8 (2) provided for ceiling of 15 % of the total permanent strength of service. The Rule was amended in 1996 by which in proviso the words 15 % of strength of service was mentioned, thus direct recruits are not entitled for quota in the temporary vacancies from any date earlier to that. This issue was specifically considered and answered by the Apex Court in O. P. Garg's case. Rule 4 (4) of the 1974 Rules provided that the Governor may from time to time in consultation with the Court leave unfilled or

held in abeyance any vacant post in the service without entitling any person to compensation or create from time to time additional post temporary or permanent as may be found necessary. The Apex Court in O. P. Garg's case held that even the creation of temporary post under Rule 4 (4) of 1974 Rules are an addition to the permanent strength of cadre as such form part of cadre. Thus according to law laid down by the Apex Court temporary post are addition to the permanent strength of the cadre. Under Rule 8 (2) proviso while determining the permanent cadre strength the temporary posts also have to be added. It is relevant to note that Rule 8 (2) proviso refers to the words permanent strength of the service and as per the judgment of the Apex Court (para 24 in O. P. Garg's case) permanent strength of service include both permanent post and temporary post. Thus while computing 15% ceiling to the quota of direct recruit both temporary post and permanent post have to be taken together as per law laid down by Apex Court in O. P. Garg's case. The amendments in Rule 8 (2) proviso in 1996, were made to give effect to pronouncement of the Apex Court made in O. P. Garg's case. Hence the submissions of promotees that temporary post need not to be added while determining the ceiling cannot be accepted by the Committee. One more reason for not accepting the said submission is that in O. P. Garg case Rule 22, which provided appointment to the direct recruits only against permanent post was struck down and it was held that direct recruits are entitled for quota both in permanent as well as temporary posts. The issue as such has to be answered in negative.

**Issue No. 6 Whether direct recruits are entitled to batch wise seniority?**

The Committee finds that Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee did not accept this demand of direct recruits and that the arguments in this regard were turned down in five judges' judgement in K.N. Singh's case. This submission of direct recruits as such cannot be accepted.

**Issue No. 7 Whether the direct recruits are entitled to seniority by applying principles of rotation in appointment according to their quota?**

The Committee finds that Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee did not accept the demand of direct recruits to apply principle of rotation in appointment according to their quota. The five judges' Bench in K.N. Singh's case (paras 18-20) also did not accept the submission. The Committee had decided that seniority of direct recruits should be determined from the date of their joining service. The direct recruits cannot be given seniority from any date prior to their birth in service. Rule 26 of UPHJS Rules, 1975 amended in 1996 provides for determination in accordance with the order of the appointment in service under Sub-Rule (1) (2) of Rule 22 of the Rules. The submission as such that the principle should be applied in respect of seniority the persons under consideration by the Committee cannot be accepted.

**Issue No. 8 Whether some of the direct recruits of 1982 and 1984 batches, who could not join due to restraint orders passed by the Courts, are entitled to seniority from any date earlier to their joining and if they are so entitled, the date from which the seniority is to be given to them?**

Shri Umesh Chandra Tiwari placed at Sl. No. 15 in TSL has made representation dated May, 5 2006 and additional representation on July 6, 2006 stating that he is direct recruit of 1982 batch, duly selected and appointed on 5.10.85 in a substantive vacancy allotted by the Court. There were 16 vacancies in all for direct recruits for which 12 direct recruits were selected from the Bar. Four Judicial Officers appeared in the examination. These Judicial Officers namely Shri Satish Kumar, Shri Umendra Nath Bansal, Shri Satya Narain Singh and Sri Ravindra Nath Verma were initially called for interview. The High Court did not select them under direct quota. They filed SLP and Writ Petition in the Supreme Court in which interim orders were passed in pursuance to which they were appointed. Hon'ble the Supreme Court then decided and dismissed all the writ petitions and special leave petitions on 11.10.84 and 24.11.84 and quashed their appointments. The interim orders were vacated and petitions were dismissed holding that as a member of U.P. Nyayik Sewa they were not entitled to appear in the quota for Advocates. In consequence, thereof, Shri U.C. Tiwari and three others were appointed as direct recruits against those four posts, which were occupied by four Judicial Officers. Sri U.C. Tiwari submits that he could not be appointed because of the interim orders passed, by which four Judicial Officers were appointed to these posts and consequently he should be given seniority from the date of the interim order or at least from the date when these four Judicial Officers were reverted. In between many promotees were appointed in Higher Judicial Service, who are shown senior to Shri U.C. Tiwari in TSL.

The Committee finds that the appointment of four Judicial Officers on the posts reserved in the quota of Advocates was not made by the High Court. They came to be appointed only by virtue of the interim orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court. These interim orders were ultimately vacated and four Judicial Officers were reverted. The appointments of Sri U.C. Tiwari and three other candidates could not be made only on account of interim orders passed by the Apex Court in favour of four Judicial Officers. In **Dr. A.R. Sircar Vs. State of U.P. & Ors.(1993) Supp 2 SCC 734** the Supreme Court held in the matter of seniority of the teachers of State Medical Colleges under U.P. State Colleges Medical Teachers Services Rules, 1990 (Rule 20), "*had it not been for the intervening stay order granted by the High Court in Writ Petition No. 1545 of 1986, the appellant would have been appointed long before the regularization of promotion of respondents 4 and 5 under the 1988 Rules. Respondents 4 and 5, who were instrumental in seeking the interim order from the High Court staying the implementation of the select list cannot be allowed to take advantage of their own wrong. The dismissal of*

*their petition on July 14, 1989 goes to show that they have successfully blocked the regular entry of the appellant on a substantive vacancy of the year 1982-83 by filing an untenable writ petition. The interim order passed by the High Court kept the appellant out from securing a regular appointment on a substantive vacancy and in the meantime respondents 4 & 5 by virtue of the 1988 Rules secured regularization of their adhoc appointments as Professors of Medicine..... If the intervening stay order had not prevented the appellant's appointment to the substantive vacancy, there can be no doubt that the appellant would have occupied that post earlier in point of time if Dr. Aggarwal was not prepared to join."* The same principle was adopted by S.D. Agarwal's Committee in V.K. Jain's case (supra). The principle that no one should suffer on account of any action of the Court, which the Court did not later on approve, is a principle in equity, which comes to the aid of the person, who has suffered on account of such action. The Committee, therefore, finds substance in the representation of Shri U.C. Tiwari that he should be given seniority from the date, when four Judicial Officers appointed under interim order passed by the Court were appointed blocking the appointment of four candidates from the Bar including Shri Umesh Chandra Tiwari. However, Shri U.C. Tiwari and three others, who could not be appointed in the circumstances given above shall be placed just below 12 direct recruits of 1982 batch. They shall not be entitled seniority above them.

In 1984 batch there were 10 posts of direct quota, which were advertised for 1984 recruitment. The promotee officers filed writ petition in Lucknow Bench of this Court that all the 10 advertised posts cannot be allocated to direct recruits as they are beyond the 15% ceiling fixed the proviso to Rule 8 (2) of the Rules of 1975. The case of the promotees was that while determining 15% ceiling for the direct recruits only permanent posts have to be reckoned with and that since at the time there were only 311 permanent posts the quota could not be more than 27. 41 officers being already working hence not more than six could be appointed. An interim order was passed on 4.7.86 by the Lucknow Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No. 4373 of 1986, S.K. Tripathi Vs. State of U.P. By the said interim order the learned single Judge permitted appointment of only six persons and appointment of more than six persons was stayed. The said interim order was subsequently clarified on 18.9.1986. The interim orders dated 4.7.1986 and 18.9.1986 are quoted as follows: -

"Hon'ble K. Nath, J.

*Petitioner No. 1 Sri S.K. Tripathi is present in person. He has filed the application for taking up the writ petition and the matter of interim stay on the ground stated in the affidavit that the opposite parties are expediting the appointment of direct recruitment from Bar to the H.J.S. and there is every likelihood of making the appointment before 7.7.86, the date on which the petition is due to be put up before the Court as endorsed by Sri Sudhir Shanker on 3.7.1986. It is stated in the affidavit that writ petition would become infructuous if the matter regarding stay is not heard today. Consequently the matter is taken up.*



*Admit and put up for Orders on the interim stay application on 7.7.1986. It is stated in para 2 of interim relief application that not more than six persons can possibly be appointed from amongst the advocates as direct recruits. It is directed that till the matter taken up by the Court on 7.7.1986 the opposite parties, shall be at liberty to appoint first six direct recruits in order of merit to the U.P.Higher Judicial Service but shall not appoint any other direct recruit to the said service.*

*A copy of the Order be given to the petitioners counsel on payment of usual charges, if possible, today.*

*SD/-(K.Nath)  
4.7.1986*

*Hon'ble K.Nath, J.  
Hon'ble P.Dayal, J.*

*Sri Sudhir Shanker the learned counsel for the petitioner says that he has received the copies of the counter affidavits on behalf of opposite parties 3,4 and 5 and request for 15 days time to file rejoinder affidavit on behalf of opposite party no.1, during the course of the day he will furnish the copies to the petitioners learned counsel.*

*Sri J.Bjalla appears on behalf of opposite party no.3 and says that the interim order dated 4.7.86 may be clarified to indicate that the liberty to the opposite parties to appoint the first 6 direct recruits according to law to the U.P.Higher Judicial Service may include the liberty to appoint persons who are entitled to such appointment on the basis of reservations. The prayer is absolutely fair and be clarified that the opposite parties will be at liberty to appoint six direct recruits in accordance with law applicable. The petitioners will have an opportunity of filing a rejoinder affidavit. List the case immediately after 10 days. Till the date of next listing, the interim order as clarified hereby shall remain in force. Sri S.P.Shukla learned counsel for opposite parties 4 and 5 points out that although he has filed a Vakalatnama on 4.8.1986 alongwith CMA No. 9980 and 9981 of 1986 and this Court had specifically ordered on 10.9.86 that his name be printed on the cause list, the office has not done so. The bench secretary points that the name of Sri S.P.Shukla has been entered on the file cover. The Additional Registrar will call for the report from the persons concerned to explain why the name of Sri S.P.Shukla has not been printed in the cause list inspite of the circumstances indicated above. Let the report be placed on the record of this case and will be considered on the next date. He will ensure that in future the name of Sri S.P.Shukla is printed in the cause list.*

*SD/-(K.Nath)  
Sd/- P.Dayal  
18.9.1986*

The writ petition was ultimately allowed by full bench of this court vide its judgement dated 10.2.1987 with the directions that the respondents shall not appoint more that six candidates. The SLP filed in the Apex Court was ultimately allowed holding that judgement of the High Court is unsustainable; Ram Kishore Gupta Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1999 SC 2961. The Apex Court held that in view of O. P. Garg's judgement in which it was held that both the temporary and permanent service will be available for direct recruits, the decision of the High Court taking into consideration only permanent posts was unsustainable. The Apex Court further noted that during the pendency of proceedings 48 temporary posts were made permanent, which have to be added in the permanent cadre. An interim order was passed by the Supreme Court on 16.12.1987 directing that appointment be given to the four persons, in pursuance of which ultimately four persons were given appointment. It is to be noted that according the interim orders of High Court six persons were entitled under their quota could be appointed. There was no restraint order in so far as six direct recruits of 1984 batch are concerned. The fact that their

appointments were not made by the State Government was not on account of interim order, which did not stay their appointments. The delay caused by the State Government for what ever reasons they may be, can not be a ground to give seniority to these persons from a date prior to the date they actually joined. The four persons, however, restrained from being appointed are entitled to get seniority from the date of the restraint order. Since six persons in their batch could be appointed in December 1986, these four persons also can not be given seniority from any date prior to that date. They will have to be placed just below the six persons of their batch. The seniority of the four direct recruits namely Sri Shiv Murti Pandey, Sri Girish Chandra Awasthi, Sri Ram Kishore Gupta and Sri Pooran Singh shall be accordingly refixed. They shall be placed immediately, below the six direct recruits of their batch.

**Issue No. 9 Whether due to increase in the vacancies for direct recruits in 1988 batch on account of inclusion of temporary vacancies in pursuance on O. P. Garg's case, the promotees are entitled to any increase in the vacancy in their quota in the subsequent batch?**

The Committee find that on the increase in the vacancies for direct recruits in 1988 batch, in view of O. P. Garg's case, the promotees were given proportionate increase in number of their quota and that they have received promotions accordingly.

**Issue No. 10 Whether the promotees are entitled to claim seniority according to their quota and that the application of rota should be rearranged according to their quota?**

The Committee has not accepted this argument for direct recruits and for same reasons the submission made by promotees, for giving them seniority to their quota by applying rotation cannot be accepted.

**Issue No. 11 Whether the members of Nyayik Sewa, who have been promoted but have not been approved so far by the Full Court, are entitled to reckon their seniority, and if yes, from which date?**

The Committee has found that 11 persons namely Sri Vijay Kumar Srivastava (Sl. No. 3), Shri Shital Singh (Sl. No. 17), Shri Shriraj Singh (Sl. No. 55), Shri Ram Kailash Shukla (Sl. No. 66), Shri Mohd. Athar (Sl. No. 72), Smt. Sushma Kumari Solanki (Sl. No. 85), Shri Subedar Singh Nimesh (Sl. No. 113), Shri Umesh Chandra II (Sl. No. 1237), Shri Yashpal Luckria (Sl. No. 1597), Shri Madan Chandra Gupta (Sl. No. 161) and Shri Shiv Kumar Singh Sengar (Sl. No. 173), placed in TSL have not been approved by the Full Court so far. Their placement in the seniority list shall be considered after their approval by the Full Court.

**Issue No. 12 Whether the direct recruits are entitled to the earlier vacancies than there are allotted to them in TSL and whether some of the promotees have been given vacancies earlier to which they were entitled?**

The Committee finds that seniority of 10 direct recruits was not fixed by Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee as the corresponding members of Nyayik Sewa were not available at that time. The Committee find that direct recruits were entitled to their vacancies in their quota at the relevant time. Those promotees in turn, who have occupied these vacancies are entitled for allocation of the vacancies in their own quota. We, however, clarify that this allocation of vacancies shall not affect those persons, whose seniority was determined by Justice S.D. Agarwal's Committee.

**Issue No. 13 Whether the promotees or direct recruits are entitled for benefit of fixation in their seniority due to long delay in the recruitment?**

The Committee does not find any merit in the argument that promotees or direct recruits are entitled to benefit of fixation of their seniority due to long delay in the recruitment. The delay in recruitment cannot be a ground for giving seniority from any date earlier than they are entitled under the statutory rules.

Having settled the issues, which arise from the submissions made on behalf of promotees and direct recruits, the Committee proceeds to decide individual objections, of the members of Higher Judicial Services after taking into consideration the relevant records. The decisions taken separately on each of the objections will form part of our record.

The Committee has accordingly drawn final seniority list after Shri S.K. Ratoori placed at SL. No. 305 of List – B of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal's report. Let the report be placed before Hon'ble the Chief Justice for appropriate orders.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(S.S. Kulshrestha)	(Ashok Bhushan)	(Sunil Ambwani)	(R.K. Agarwal)	(B.S. Chauhan)
19.03.2007	19.03.2007	19.03.2007	19.03.2007	19.03.2007

In pursuance of circulation of tentative seniority list among the officers of U.P. Higher Judicial Service objections have been received. These objections are being disposed of as under: -

**A. Objections preferred by officers of Higher Judicial Service directly recruited from Bar -**

1. **Sri U.C. Tiwari**, placed at Sl. No. 15 in the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 8-15 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
  1. TSL has not been drawn in accordance with principles followed by the earlier committee.
  2. He should be placed alongwith his batch mates appointed earlier and given vacancy of 1982 batch.
  2. Officers not appointed under Rule 22 (1) are not entitled to seniority on continuous officiation basis.
  3. V.K. Verma has been placed senior to him without any opportunity of hearing.
  4. He could not join because of stay order, therefore, his date of joining should be the date of stay order in view of law laid down in A.R. Sircar Vs. State of UP 1992 ALJ 893 and Pilla Sitaram Patrudu Vs. UOI JT 1996 (4) SC 731.
  5. Date of joining of 10 Direct Recruits of 1984 batch be taken as 4-7-1986 i.e. the date of stay order.
  6. Wrong allocation of vacancies to Direct Recruits.
  7. Fresh seniority list be prepared after serial number 305.

*Sri U.C. Tiwari, a selected candidate by way of Direct Recruitment from Bar of 1982 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch was appointed as Additional District & Sessions Judge under Rule 22 (1) of U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 alongwith similarly selected candidates Sri Narendra Singh (Sl. No.13 of TSL), Sri Krishna Kumar-III (Sl. No.14 of the TSL) and Sri Udhao Singh (Sl. No. 16 of the TSL) vide Govt. notification dated 1.10.1985. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1, 3 & 8 these four officers are entitled to be placed at Sl. Nos. 1 to 4 of the seniority list, in the order in which their names stand in the appointment order, officers occupying these places are to be down placed in the seniority list, the representation of Sri U.C. Tiwari is decided accordingly.*

2. **Sri Nirvikar Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 45 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 521-526 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
  1. TSL is not complete in as much as the vacancies allocated to the JOs have not been shown.
  2. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with principles adopted by the earlier seniority committee chaired by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal.
  3. Vacancies reserved for 10 Direct Recruits of 1984 batch by the earlier seniority committee have been wrongly disturbed and allotted to other officers.
  4. 5 vacancies to the 5 left over Direct Recruits of 1982 batch should be allotted from amongst the vacancies available for 1982 batch.
  5. After so allotting vacancies the seniority of these 5 Direct Recruits has to be fixed.
  6. Vacancies already allocated by the Hon'ble Court have been changed and different principles have been applied in preparing the TSL
  7. Dates of joining of Direct Recruits of 1984 batch are also incorrect.
  8. According to him he was prevented to join service by virtue of stay order dated 4-7-1986, which was vacated later on hence his date of joining should be taken as 4-7-1986 and not the actual date of joining in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in A.R. Sircar Vs. State of UP 1992 ALJ 893 (SC) and Pilla Sitaram Patrudu & Others Vs. Union of India JT 1996 (4) SC 731.
  9. For completing list B principles for preparing further seniority list have been enclosed with the objections.

10. Separate calculations for batch 1976, 1978, 1980, 1982, and 1984 have also been filed.

*Sri Nirvikar Gupta and nine other members of Bar were approved for their appointment in U.P.H.J.S. in the quota of Direct Recruits from Bar vide Full Court resolution dated 24.8.1985. Names of these ten selected candidates were sent to the Govt. for issuing necessary notification for their appointment. Out of ten six such selected candidates were appointed by the State Government as Additional District & Sessions Judge under Rule 22 (1) of the said Rules vide Govt. notification dated 6.11.1986. Appointment of four selected candidates could not be made due to stay order dated 4.7.1986 passed by the High Court in Writ Petition No. 4373 of 1986, S.K. Tripathi Vs. State of U.P.*

*So far as the grounds taken by Sri Gupta in support of his claim for seniority are concerned these grounds have been considered by the Committee while deciding Issue No. 8. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3 & 8 claim of Sri Gupta for seniority from the date of the stay order dated 4.7.1986 cannot be accepted, his objections are decided accordingly.*

3. **Sri V.P. Singh-II**, placed at Sl. No. 48 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1907-1911 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He is a Direct Recruit of 1984 batch, his joining was delayed due to stay order dated 4-7-1986 and he was allowed to join on 17-12-86.
2. On the principle of rota and quota he should have been placed along with 34 officers promoted in the year 1984 and he should be placed above those officers who were promoted beyond strength either in the year 1984 or 1985
3. His seniority should be determined in accordance with UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991.
4. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly

*Sri V.P. Singh-II is a Direct Recruit from Bar of 1984 Recruitment Batch. He was also appointed alongwith Sri Nirvikar Gupta vide Government notification dated 6.11.1986.*

*So far as the grounds taken by Sri Singh in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these grounds have been considered by the Committee while deciding Issue No. 8. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 8 claim of Sri Singh for seniority from the date of the stay order dated 4.7.1986 cannot be accepted.*

*Sri Singh has also sought support for his claim for seniority with the help of U.P. Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991. This ground also lacks merit as these rules have been framed by the State Government under Article 309 of the Constitution. These rules have not been made in consultation with the High Court. In view of provisions contained in Article 233 these rules cannot have any application with regard to determination of seniority of Judicial Officers.*

*Objections of Sri V.P. Singh-II are decided accordingly.*

4. **Sri G.C. Awasthi**, placed at Sl. No. 107 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 56-74 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has prayed that 10 Direct Recruits of 1984 batch be given seniority w.e.f. 4-7-1986.

2. According to him calculation and allocation of vacancies are wrong and improper.
3. On 4-7-1986 in WP No. 4373 of 1986 filed by Srikant Tripathi appointments of last four candidates of Recruitment batch 1984 were stayed. These four candidates were appointed vide order dated 16-12-1987 of the Hon'ble Apex Court passed in C.A. No. 4010 of 1987.
4. He has claimed that his date of appointment be reckoned as 4-7-1986.
5. He has further stated that Officers of UP Nyayik Sewa who were promoted in HJS after 4-7-1986 cannot be ranked senior to him and 9 other Direct Recruits of 1984 batch.
6. According to him 5 Direct Recruits of 1982 batch appointed in October 1985 has to be allocated vacancies which were available in the quota of DR of 1982 batch.

*Sri G.C. Awasthi alongwith Sri Shiv Murti Pandey (TSL No. 106), Sri Ram Kishore Gupta (TSL No. 108) and Sri Pooran Singh (TSL No. 109) could not be appointed alongwith Sri Suresh Chadra Dixit and five others against the vacancies of the quota of Direct Recruits for Recruitment Batch 1984 though their names were recommended to the Government. These four selected candidates could get their appointments in pursuance of interim order dated 16.12.1987 passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 4010/1987- Ram Kishore Gupta Vs. State of U.P. Their appointments under Rule 22 (1) of the said Rules were made by the Government vide Government notification dated 15.1.1988.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3, 8 & 12 names of Sri Awasthi and three others are to be placed below Sri Ram Das (Sl. No. 49 of the TSL), officers occupying these places are to be down placed in the seniority list. Objections of Sri G.C. Awasthi in respect of his claim for seniority are decided accordingly.*

5. **Sri V.K. Mathur**, placed at Sl. No. 253 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 433-443 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid down in O.P. Garg's case.*

*The ground raised by Sri Mathur that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1) (a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted*

*in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

6. **Sri Dinesh Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 254 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1051-1058 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He be placed after Sri Chhote Lal (NS) and Sri R.K. Srivastava (JO) and above Sri R.P. Singh (NS) and Sri Pal (JO).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds raised by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Gupta that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1) (a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

7. **Sri A.K. Srivastava-III**, placed at Sl. No. 255 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1395-1402 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 batch and his name was recommended for appointment vide Full Court Resolution dated 6-4-91 and 25-7-92.
2. The State Government instead of making appointment in order of rota have issued separate notifications.
3. Seniority of Officers of his batch should be fixed as per rota quota rule.
4. Out of 182 promotee officers last 76 officers are not entitled to be considered for fixation of seniority with Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
5. Appointment of 9 Direct Recruits including objector was stayed under stay order dated 28-5-92, objector is entitled to benefit of seniority for the period of stay as has been allowed to Sri V.K. Jain, Direct Recruit of 1976 batch.
6. He is entitled to be placed below Sri J.S.P. Singh (NS) and above Sri Swaroop Lal (NS).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*He also claims seniority from the date of stay order dated 28.5.1992 passed in Writ Petition No. 3118 of 1992, the appointment of promotee officers recommended with the Direct Recruits of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment were also stayed by the High Court on 13.7.1992. As appointments from both the streams were stayed and the Writ Petition filed by Sri S.K. Tripathi has been allowed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide judgment dated 7.9.2001 reported in AIR 2001 Supreme Court 3757 no notional seniority can be given to Sri A.K. Srivastava-III. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**8. Dr. Manjoo Nigam**, placed at Sl. No. 256 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 998-1006 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under: -

1. She has stated that the TSL has been prepared against the principles settled by the earlier seniority committee chaired by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal and is also against rules, law and pronouncement of Hon'ble Apex Court.
2. She is a Direct Recruit of 1988 batch and Recruitment period of her batch was 1-1-1988 to 31-12-1990.
3. 218 officers of Nyayik Sewa and 18 officers of J.O. service and 24 members of Bar were recommended for appointment under Rule 22 (1) in UP HJS. Names of 48 Officers of Nyayik Sewa were also recommended by the Full Court to be appointed in UP HJS against the vacancies occurred between 1-1-91 to 31-12-92.
4. Seniority of her batch is to be determined as per amended rule 26.
5. Names of 09 advocates including her were recommended by the Full Court on 6-4-1991 for their appointment but they could not be appointed due to stay order 28-5-1992 passed by Hon'ble Court in WP No. 3118/1992 S.K. Tripathi Vs. State of UP. The said writ petition was dismissed, therefore, she is entitled to get her seniority be counted from the date of stay order i.e. 28-5-1992 as was done in respect of Sri V.K. Jain Direct Recruit of 1976 batch.
6. While determining seniority provisions of Rules 20, 22 (1) (2) have to be followed and seniority has to be determined Recruitment year wise and no benefit of officiation can be given if vacancy was not available in the quota.
7. The present committee has to consider entire substantive vacancies of 1984 and 85 Recruitment, which come to 75. Out of these vacancies respective quota of each source has to be allocated and 22 promotee officers have to be pushed down.
8. Her seniority has to be determined along with the promotee officers on the basis of rota
9. She has requested that she be placed after Sri Jai Shanker Prasad (NS) and Sri Jai Ram Mishra (JO).

*She is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by her in support of her claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by her also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*She has also claimed seniority from the date of stay order dated 28.5.1992 passed in Writ Petition No. 3118 of 1992, the appointment of promotee officers recommended with the Direct Recruits of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment were also stayed by the High Court on 13.7.1992. As appointment from both the streams were stayed and the Writ Petition filed by Sri S.K. Tripathi has been allowed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide Judgment dated 7.9.2001 reported in AIR 2001 Supreme Court 3757 no notional seniority can be given to Dr. Manjoo Nigam.*

*The ground raised by Dr. Nigam that her seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26*



*(1) (a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. Her objections are decided accordingly and her request for placement is rejected.*

9. **Sri S.N. Mishra**, placed at Sl. No. 257 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1232-1244 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed below Smt. Sushma Kumari Solanki and one officer of J.O. service and above Sri V.B. Rai.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Mishra that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1) (a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

10. **Sri Surendra Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 258 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 760-771 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He has requested that he be placed after Sri Md. Razi Siddiqui (NS) and Sri P.S. Mahi (J.O.) and above Sri K.P. Mishra (NS).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the*

*Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Kumar that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**11. Sri Anil Kumar Agarwal**, placed at Sl. No. 259 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1795-1812 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He has requested that his name be placed below Sri A.P. Misra (NS) and Sri R.K. Gupta (JO) and above Sri Sher Singh (NS) and Sri Mahesh Chandra-II (JO).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Agarwal that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**12. Sri Nand Lal Agarwal**, placed at Sl. No. 260 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1217-1230 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.

5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Agarwal that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

**13. Sri S.V.S. Rathore**, placed at Sl. No. 261 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 416-429 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. While allocating quota against temporary and permanent posts, the 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve created by notification no. 3920/7-Subordinate Courts-350/84 dated July 10, 1987, cannot form part of cadre strength for allocation of quota and seniority as these 84 posts were ex-cadre posts.
2. Apart from these 84 posts, four posts, which were created, vide G.O. No. 4218/Saat-Nyaya-1-69/90 dt. 31.12.90 have also to be excluded as no appointment on these posts could have been made up to 31.12.1990. Thus cadre strength for 1988 batch comes to 508, which has been found by the Selection Committee.
3. The Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have to be placed in rotation with the 218 officers of the N.S. who were substantively appointed vide notification dated 05.04.1994.
4. The 48 officers, who were appointed by a separate notification dated 05.04.1994 (From Sri Ami Chand to Sri Zamir Uddin), cannot be placed with the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch because their appointments were not against vacancies available for 1988 batch they were appointed against the period enhanced for promotee officers only up to 31.12.1990
5. The promotee officers appointed under rule 22(3) and 22 (4) can not be considered for seniority as has been decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in S. K. Tripathi Case (2001) SCC 237.
6. The Seniority for 1988 batch has to be determined in view of allocation of vacancies and in the order of rotation. So the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have to be rotated from Sri Om Pal Singh, whose name appears at serial no. 1 in the notification dated 05.04.1994.
7. Direct Recruits of 1988 batch also claim that the period for which their appointments were delayed due to stay order be also excluded and they should be deemed to have been appointed on the date when the stay order was passed.
8. Direct Recruits at Sl. Nos. 263, 273 and 276 of the circulated list also claim seniority within their batch.
9. For Recruitment of 1988 batch vacancies up to 31.12.1990 will be available for sharing and only 70% would go to the promotee officers. Other promotee officers, working in quota of Direct Recruits or J.Os will have to be pushed down and any promotee officer working in excess of 70% quota cannot claim seniority D. Ganesh Rao Patnayak and others Vs. State of Jharkhand and others (2005) 8 SCC page 454.
10. In a block period all the vacancies whether permanent or temporary will be calculated for working out quota as proviso to Rule 8 talks of total permanent strength and not of permanent posts only as clarified in O.P. Garg Case and S.K. Tripathi Case.
11. The seniority would be, in order of appointment as contemplated under Rule 22 (2) otherwise inter-se seniority of the same batch will be disturbed.
12. In view of S. K. Tripathi Case, the date of joining will be treated as the date of appointment and any inaction or omission on the part of the State Government, in not adhering to Rule 22 (2), would affect the legal

consequences available under rule. Seniority cannot be determined under the old rules. The promotees will get seniority only after their selection under Rule 20 and not before any date anterior to that. Admittedly none of the promotee officer working under Rule 22(3) had undergone selection under Rule 20.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3,5,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Rathore that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

**14. Sri S.K. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 262 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1647-1660 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 batch. For Recruitment of 1988 batch vacancies existing or occurred in 1988 and 1989 should be counted and only those promotees who have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) against the vacancies of 1988 batch could be placed with the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch and they be placed in accordance with Rule 22 (2) as per rota.
2. Officers promoted under Rule 22 (3) and 22 (4) cannot claim the benefit of officiation until they are appointed under Rule 22 (1) in view of S.K. Tripathi's case.
3. Seniority of Direct Recruits should be determined in order of appointment as per amended Rule 26.
4. 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve will be counted for Recruitment batch 1990 since these posts have become permanent w.e.f. 1-1-91.
5. Four posts of HJS created vide GO dated 31-12-90 cannot be computed for Recruitment batch 1990.
6. Lucknow Bench of Hon'ble Court in UP JSA's case has set aside the report of Hon'ble Committee chaired by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.N. Agarwal, now no part of that report cannot be relied for working out the permanent strength.
7. He has requested that seniority list be drawn afresh in the light of submission made above.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Saxena that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR*

*2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**15. Sri K.U. Khan**, placed at Sl. No. 263 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1995- 2006 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been drawn without following the principles adopted by the earlier seniority committee.
2. Seniority of HJS officers of 1988 batch is to be determined according to amended Rule 26.
3. He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 batch and his name was recommended for appointment on 6-4-1991.
4. His name has been included with the name of 16 Direct Recruits recommended on 25-7-1992.
5. He is entitled to be placed according to rotational system with 170 promotee officers of 1988 batch.
6. Rest 84 promotee officers are not entitled to claim seniority with Direct Recruits including the objector of 1988 batch.
7. Promotee officers (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) have been promoted against the vacancies of subsequent Recruitment batch. They cannot be placed above the objector.
8. He be placed below Sri R.P. Pandey and above Sri A.K. Jain

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Khan that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**16. Sri A.P. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 265 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1912-1928 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of*

*U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202. His objections are decided accordingly.*

*The ground raised by Sri Singh that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**17. Sri H.K. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 266 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 659-661 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that Direct Recruits have not properly been placed.
2. Neither they have been placed in accordance with provision of Rule 22 (2) nor they have been placed according to date of vacancy made available to them.
3. He is entitled to get his name placed at Sl. No. 63 because he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-11-86.
4. He has requested that seniority list be modified accordingly.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. In view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202 and decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 7 grounds raised by him appear to be without substance, his objections are decided accordingly.*

**18. Sri S.N. Dwivedi**, placed at Sl. No. 267 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1791-1794 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 batch, his seniority should be determined along with the promotee officers who have been promoted against the vacancies of 1988 batch i.e. upto 31-12-90.
2. In the TSL promotee officers promoted in May 1994 against the vacancies occurred after 31-12-90 have been wrongly placed above him.
3. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. In view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202 and decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 7 grounds raised by him appear to be without substance, his objections are decided accordingly.*

**19. Smt. Sandhya Bhatt**, placed at Sl. No. 269 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 293-303 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. She has stated that provisions of Rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 of HJS as amended in 1996 are to be considered together in fixing the inter-se seniority in between promotees and Direct Recruits against the vacancy of the same year of allotment. It is not the date of joining or order of appointments shall guide fixation of inter-se seniority between Direct Recruits and promotees. It is year of allotment of vacancy which is determining factor in fixing inter-se seniority between the Direct Recruits and Promotees.
2. She has prayed that seniority of Direct Recruits of her batch i.e. 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system.
3. She has stated 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. She has further stated that in respect of appointment of officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch Rule 20 has not been followed.
5. She has further pleaded that appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post. According to her, for fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*She is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by her in support of her claim for seniority, are concerned these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2, 3, 7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by her also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Smt. Sandhya Bhatt that her seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of her appointment i.e. when she was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. Her objections are decided accordingly.*

**20. Sri V.C. Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 270 of the TSL and Sri V.P. Pathak at Sl. No. 268 have preferred their objections (page nos. 332-387 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by them in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*They are Direct Recruits of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by them in support of their claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by them also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by them that their seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when they are inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. Their objections are decided accordingly.*

**21. Sri Y.C. Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 271 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1629-1646 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.

3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He be placed below Sri V.N. Chadda (NS) and above Sri Mohammad Ajiz-ur-rahman (NS).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Gupta that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**22. Mohd. Tahir**, placed at Sl. No. 272 of the TSL and Mushaffey Ahmad at Sl. No. 275 have preferred their objections (page nos. 1873-1890 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by them in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*They are Direct Recruits of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by them in support of their claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by them also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by them that their seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when they are inducted in the cadre vide*



*P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210.  
Their objections are decided accordingly.*

23. **Sri N.K. Rajoria**, placed at Sl. No. 273 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 32-37 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. A Direct Recruit of 1988 batch, he was recommended for appointment vide Full Court resolution dated 6-4-1991. He was placed on 8th position, subsequently names of 16 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch were also recommended. Hon'ble Apex Court in C.A. No. 5908/95 Sri Kant Tripathi and others Vs. State of UP and others has declared the selection of 16 Direct Recruits illegal. Therefore, these 16 Direct Recruits cannot be placed above him.
2. He has requested that he be placed 7 steps below to the final placement of Sri Nirvikar Gupta.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. He has been appointed alongwith 23 Direct Recruits as Additional District & Sessions Judge under Rule 22 (1) of the said Rules vide Government notification dated 9.5.1994. He was placed at Sl. No. 21 of the notification. He has misinterpreted the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case. His objections are without substance and deserve to be rejected. Objections of Sri N.K. Rajoria are hereby rejected.*

24. **Sri Dina Nath-II**, placed at Sl. No. 274 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1031-1041 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Nath that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

25. **Sri Lalta Prasad-III**, placed at Sl. No. 274 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1031-1041 of the compilation). He has adopted the objections filed by Sri Kaleemullah Khan.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on the objections of Sri Kaleem Ullah Khan, objections of Sri Lalta Prasad-III are also rejected.*

26. **Sri U.S. Tomar**, placed at Sl. No. 280 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1291 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he is a Direct Recruit of 1990 batch and he joined the service on 3-8-1996. While making recruitment in 1990 batch procedure of recruitment as provided by rules was not strictly adhered to.
2. Officers of UP NS have been given appointment within one or two years from the date when vacancy has become available to them whereas Direct Recruitment in HJS cadre was deliberately delayed. Thus officers of NS have got undue advantage in fixation of seniority.
3. If his seniority is determined in accordance with rule i.e. on the basis of rotational system he will get seniority above the officers of NS who were promoted in the year 1991 at least.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1990 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 13 grounds raised by him do not survive. His objections are devoid of merit and rejected accordingly.*

27. **Sri H.S. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 281 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1139-1147 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he is a Direct Recruit of 1990 batch and he joined the service on 3-8-1996. While making recruitment in 1990 batch procedure of recruitment as provided by rules was not strictly adhered to.
2. Officers of UP NS have been given appointment within one or two years from the date when vacancy has become available to them whereas Direct Recruitment in HJS cadre was deliberately delayed. Thus officers of NS have got under advantage in fixation of seniority.
3. If his seniority is determined in accordance with Rule i.e. on the basis of rotational system he will get seniority above the officers of NS who were promoted in the year 1991 at least.

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1990 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 13 grounds raised by him do not survive. His objections are devoid of merit and rejected accordingly*

28. **Sri M.K. Singhal**, placed at Sl. No. 289 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1746-1749 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.12.1988. He is entitled to get his seniority fixed from this date.
2. Promotee officers placed above him have been allotted vacancies subsequent to 31.12.1988
3. Promotee officers appointed against the vacancies of later years should not be placed about the appointees recruited on vacancies of earlier year (D. G. Patnayak's case)
4. The objector has been recruited in Recruitment batch 1992-94 and he was placed first in the merit list therefore, he should not be placed below Sri Chaturbhuji N. Singh (Sl. No. 176)

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Argument similar to his has been rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of J.C. Patnayak Vs. State of Orissa 1998 (4) SCC 456 ( para 32). He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao Patnayak Vs. State of Jharkhand, AIR 2005 Supreme Court 4321. The facts of this case are entirely different because in this case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of the quota of Direct Recruits whereas here the promotee officers placed above him have been allotted vacancies within their quota. Thus his objections are without substance and are disposed of accordingly.*

29. **Smt. Vijay Lakshmi**, placed at Sl. No. 291 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 257-259 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. She has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.1.1989. She is entitled to get her seniority fixed from this date.
2. Promotee officers placed above her have been allotted vacancy subsequent to 31.1.1989.
3. She has stated that her name has been incorrectly spelt in the TSL; she has prayed that spelling of her name be corrected as Smt. Vijay Lakshmi.
4. She has prayed that her seniority be fixed some where near the year 1989 as for her vacancy occurred on 31-1-1989 has been allotted. In the alternative she has prayed that her name should be placed at Sl. No. 233.

*She is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Argument similar to her has been rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of J.C. Patnayak Vs. State of Orissa 1998 (4) SCC 456 (para 32). She has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao Patnayak Vs. State of Jharkhand, AIR 2005 Supreme Court 4321. The facts of this case are entirely different because in this case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of the quota of Direct Recruits whereas here the promotee officers placed above her have been allotted vacancies within their quota. Thus her objections are without substance and disposed of accordingly.*

30. **Sri P.K. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 293 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1433-1445 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. According to him, while calculating the vacancies of 1988 batch 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve have been wrongly included.
2. 4 posts of HJS cadre created vide GO dated 31-12-90 are liable to be excluded from the calculation of vacancies of 1988 batch.
3. Out of 218 officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed in H.J.S. vide Government notification dated 5-4-92, 47 officers at Sl. Nos. 1 to 2, 4 to 16, 18 to 49, 51 and 52 have been excluded in the TSL in order of accommodate 47 officers at Sl Nos. 206 to 252.
4. Officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed under new Rule 22 (3) could not get benefit of officiation.
5. He has claimed that his seniority be fixed keeping in view the rota provided under Rule 22 (2).
6. He has requested that he be placed below Sri H.N. Mishra (Sl No. 242) and above Sri S.P. Shukla (NS).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Grounds mentioned by him except No. 3 do not survive in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,7,9 & decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case. Ground No. 3 is also without substance. Seniority of 47 promotee officers mentioned by him has already been determined by the earlier Committee. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

31. **Sri R.B. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 295 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 734-746 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply
7. He has prayed that he be placed after Sri S.P. Shukla (Sl. No. 248) and above Sri A.K. Malviya (Sl. No. 243)

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Yadav that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**32. Sri Mukhtar Ahmad**, placed at Sl. No. 297 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1423-1432 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve have been wrongly included.
2. 4 posts of HJS cadre created vide GO dated 31-12-90 are liable to be excluded from the calculation of vacancies of 1988 batch
3. Out of 218 officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed in H.J.S, vide Government notification dated 5-4-92, 47 Officers at Sl. Nos. 1 to 2, 4 to 16, 18 to 49, 51 and 52 have been excluded in the TSL in order to accommodate 47 officers at Sl No. 206 to 252
4. Officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed under new Rule 22 (3) could not get benefit of officiation.
5. He has claimed that his seniority be fixed keeping in view the quota provided under Rule 22 (2).
6. He has requested that he be placed below Sri Arun Kumar Malviya (Sl.No. 243) and above Sri S.K. I. Naqvi (Sl. No. 244).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Grounds mentioned by him except No. 3 do not survive in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7,9 & decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case. Ground No. 3 is also without substance. Seniority of 47 promotee officers mentioned by him has already been determined by the earlier Committee. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**33. Sri A.K. Misra-I**, placed at Sl. No. 299 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1615-1624 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He has requested that he be placed below Sri S.K. I. Naqvi (Sl No. 244) and above Sri Mohan Kumar Bansal (Sl. No. 292)

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds, stated by him in support of his claim for seniority, are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the*

*Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Misra that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected*

**34. Sri Anant Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 301 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 402-415 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He should be placed above Muzaffar Hussain at Sl. No. 245 and below Mohan Kumar Bansal at Sl. No. 292

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Kumar that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

**35. Sri Amar Singh Chauhan**, placed at Sl. No. 303 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 681-693 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.

7. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed below Sri Muzaffar Hussain (Sl. No. 245) and above Sri Ghanshyam Shukla (Sl. No. 246)

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1988 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Chauhan that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly and his request for placement is rejected.*

- 36. Sri Kamal Kishore Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 307 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 671-680 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. According to him, while calculating the vacancies of 1988 batch 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve have been wrongly included.
2. 4 posts of HJS cadre created vide GO dated 31-12-90 are liable to be excluded from the calculation of vacancies of 1988 batch.
3. Out of 218 officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed in H.J.S. vide Government notification dated 5-4-92, 47 officers at Sl. Nos. 1 to 2, 4 to 16, 18 to 49, 51 and 52 have been excluded in the TSL in order to accommodate 47 officers at Sl No. 206 to 252.
4. Officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed under new Rule 22 (3) could not get benefit of officiation.
5. He has claimed that his seniority be fixed keeping in view the rota provided under Rule 22 (2).
6. He has requested that his seniority be fixed below Mata Prasad Gupta (Sl. No. 247) and above Sri V.P. Shukla (Sl No. 248).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Grounds mentioned by him except No. 3 do not survive in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,7,9 & decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case. Ground No. 3 is also without substance. Seniority of 47 promotee officers mentioned by him has already been determined by the earlier Committee. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

- 37. Sri Harsh Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 309 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 388-401 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He should be placed somewhere after officer placed at Sl No. 229 in TSL

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Kumar that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

**38. Sri Ali Zamin**, placed at Sl. No. 311 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1824-1836 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:.

1. The seniority of Direct Recruits of 1988 batch be fixed on the basis of rotational system and 48 officers of UPNS (Sl. Nos. 206 to 252) cannot be placed above the DRs of 1988 batch.
2. The DRs of 1982 and 1984 batch cannot be placed below any promotee officer of subsequent batch.
3. 84 vacancies created vide G.O. dated 10-7-1987 and 4 posts created vide G.O. dated 31-12-90 be excluded from the cadre strength of 1988 batch.
4. Rule 20 has not been followed in appointment of the officers of UP Nyayik Sewa in 1988 batch.
5. The appointments made under Rule 22(3) and 22(4) not to be treated on substantive post.
6. For fixation of seniority of 1988 batch provisions of amended Rule 26(1) will apply.
7. He has requested that he be placed below Sri V.K. Dixit (Sl. No. 249) and above Sri R.P. Lavaniya (Sl. No. 250).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. So far as the grounds stated by him in support of his claim for seniority are concerned, these appear to be without substance in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 9. Rest of the grounds raised by him also appear to be without substance in view of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of O.P. Garg Vs. State of U.P., AIR 1991 Supreme Court 1202.*

*The ground raised by Sri Zamin that his seniority should be determined in accordance with U.P.H.J.S. Rules, 1975 as amended in 1996 instead of old Rule 26 (1)(a) cannot be accepted as it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that seniority of the appointee will be determined in accordance with the Rules existing at the time of his appointment i.e. when he was inducted in the cadre vide P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 SC 1210. His objections are decided accordingly.*

**39. Sri Shashi Kant**, placed at Sl. No. 315 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1255-1267 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. According to him, while calculating the vacancies of 1988 batch 84 posts of leave and deputation reserve have been wrongly included.
2. 4 posts of HJS cadre created vide GO dated 4.2.1992 are liable to be excluded from the calculation of vacancies of 1988 batch.
3. Out of 218 officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed in H.J.S. vide Government notification dated 5-4-92, 47 officers at Sl. Nos. 1 to 2, 4 to 16, 18 to 49, 51 and 52 have been excluded in the TSL in order of accommodate 47 officers at Sl Nos. 206 to 252.

4. Officers of Nyayik Sewa appointed under new Rule 22 (3) could not get benefit of officiation.
5. He has claimed that his seniority be fixed keeping in view the rota provided under Rule 22 (2).
6. He has requested that his seniority be fixed below Mata Prasad Gupta (Sl. No. 247) and above Sri V.P. Shukla (Sl No. 248).

*He is a Direct Recruit of 1992-1994 H.J.S. Recruitment Batch. Grounds mentioned by him except No. 3 do not survive in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,7,9 & decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case. Ground No. 3 is also without substance. Seniority of 47 promotee officers mentioned by him has already been determined by the earlier Committee. He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. These cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

40. **Sri Om Prakash**, placed at Sl. No. 317 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 75-76 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has requested that he may be placed below Sri Surendra Pratap Singh (Sl. No. 288 of the TSL).
2. According to him, he is entitled to get seniority on the basis of date of vacancy made available to him

*He has claimed seniority on the basis of date of vacancy made available to him. In the case of J.C. Patnayak Vs State of Orissa (1998) 4 SCC 456 (Para 32) this argument has not found favour of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore his objections are rejected.*

41. **Sri V.P. Kandpal**, placed at Sl. No. 727 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1379-1384 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent years have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Kandpal appear to be without substance.*



*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

42. **Sri Rajendra Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 728 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1734-1737 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Kumar appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

43. **Sri A.K. Ganesh**, placed at Sl. No. 729 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1211-1215 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.

5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Ganesh appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority Recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**44. Sri Mohd. Faiz A. Khan**, placed at Sl. No. 730 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1750-1754 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Khan appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

45. **Sri V.K. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 731 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2013-2014 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has not been given seniority of the date of vacancy against which he has been appointed i.e. 21.10.1994
2. He has stated that his seniority has not been determined along with promotee officers appointed in 2005 as per rotational system under Rule 22 (2).

*The claim of seniority on the basis of date of vacancy allotted to the officers has not found favour with the Hon'ble Apex Court and in the case of J.C. Patnayak similar argument has been rejected by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Second ground raised by him cannot be accepted in view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 7. Therefore, his objections are hereby rejected.*

46. **Sri Bhupendra Sahai**, placed at Sl. No. 732 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1404-1412 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. In view of law laid down in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh R. Patnayak's case, Officers recruited from all the three sources should have been placed in the seniority list on the basis date of vacancy available to him.
2. In preparing seniority list quota rota rule should be strictly observed and appointment of promotee officer should be made after recruitment from Bar have been made.
3. He has requested that his name be placed below Km. Manju Rani Gupta and above Sri Rajendra Pal (NS) at Sl. No. 310 and 312 respectively.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 7 ground No. 2 mentioned above cannot be accepted.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected*

47. **Sri S.K. Pachori** placed at Sl. No. 734 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1421-1422 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with provisions contained in Rule 22 and 26.
2. TSL has not been drawn as per law laid down in D. Ganesh R. Patnayak's case.
3. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 7 ground No. 2 mentioned above cannot be accepted.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of*

*seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**48. Sri S.K. Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 735 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1850-1856 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Gupta appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**49. Ms. Ghandikota Sree Devi**, placed at Sl. No. 736 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 988-993 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. She has stated that she has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. She along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, she and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. She has requested that at worst she and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Ms. Ghandikota appear to be without substance.*

*She has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by her are devoid of merit and her objections are hereby rejected.*

**50. Sri K.S. Zaggi**, placed at Sl. No. 737 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1845-1849 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, she and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. She has requested that at worst she and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Zaggi appear to be without substance.*

*She has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**51. Sri Anil Kumar Agarwal**, placed at Sl. No. 731 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2013-2014 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has not been given seniority from the date of vacancy against which he has been appointed

2. He has not been placed as per rotational system with promotee officers of 2005 batch.
3. He has requested that he be given proper seniority as per law.

*The claim of seniority on the basis of date of vacancy allotted to the officers not found favour with the Hon'ble Apex Court and in the case of J.C. Patnayak, similar argument has been rejected by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case. Second ground raised by him cannot be accepted in view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 7. Therefore, his objections are hereby rejected.*

**52. Sri R.A. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 739 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1866-1868 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Yadav appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**53. Sri N.K. Jauhari**, placed at Sl. No. 740 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1045-1050 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.

6. At the worst, she and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Jauhari appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**54. Sri R.S. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 741 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1298-1300 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Yadav appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**55. Sri Rajbeer Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 742 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1869-1872 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Singh appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**56. Sri Ajit Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 743 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1935-1938 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Singh appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were*



*occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. This case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**57. Sri S.C. Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 744 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1607-1609 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.
6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Singh appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. As this case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

**58. Sri Bhopal Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 745 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1962-1968 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has not been given placement according to rota as prescribed in Rule 22 (2).
2. Direct Recruits of various batches have not been given seniority batch wise or year wise.
3. According to the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in S.N. Singh's case and D. Ganesh Rao's case candidates recruited against earlier vacancies should be reckoned senior to those recruited against later vacancies.
4. Provisions of rule 22 (1) and (2) and Rule 26 have to be read together in fixing inter-se seniority among both the sources of recruitment against the vacancies of the same year of allotment.
5. He along with 18 Direct Recruits have been recruited against the vacancies occurred on 31-10-1994 or prior to it but promotee officers appointed against vacancies of subsequent year have been wrongly placed above them.

6. At the worst, he and 18 other Direct Recruits of 2000 batch should be given seniority in rotation just below S.Z. Siddiqui (Sl. No. 350).
7. He has requested that at worst he and other Direct Recruits should be placed above the promotees appointed in the year 2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 3,6,7 and decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case the grounds mentioned by Sri Singh appear to be without substance.*

*He has placed reliance on D. Ganesh Rao's case and S.N. Singh's case. Facts of these cases are quite different. In D. Ganesh Rao's case promotee officers were occupying vacancies of Direct Recruits quota, whereas in the present matter promotee officers have been allotted vacancies within their quota. S.N. Singh's case (1998) 5 SCC- 246 relates to dispute of seniority in respect of Munsifs appointed by way of two different recruitments. As this case deals with the matter of determination of seniority recruited from one source i.e. Direct Recruitment. Both these cases possibly can have no application in the present matter. The grounds raised by him are devoid of merit and his objections are hereby rejected.*

## **B. Objections preferred by promotee officers of Higher Judicial Service -**

1. **Sri R.P. Srivastava-II**, placed at Sl. No. 4 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 603-633, 931-963 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
  1. He has stated that he was promoted to HJS on 10-7-1985. Sri V.K. Verma joined the UP HJS on 29-10-87 and Sri S.C. Nigam joined the UP HJS on 23-7-1985 but these two officers have been shown as senior to him.
  2. He has been granted super time scale on 20-04-04 w.e.f. 1-11-02 whereas Sri S.C. Nigam has been granted super time scale vide Court's order dated 16-2-05 w.e.f. 1-11-02 and he was given super time scale from 1-10-02.
  3. He has joined HJS two years three months prior to Sri V.K. Verma and he was granted super time scale before Sri S.C. Nigam. Therefore, he is entitled to be placed after Sri A.K. Roopanwal but above Sri V.K. Verma and S.C. Nigam.
  4. He has requested that he may be placed senior to Sri V.K. Verma and S.C. Nigam.

*Seniority of Sri V.K. Verma has already been determined by the earlier Seniority Committee. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 1 objection of Sri R.P. Srivastava in respect of placement of Sri V.K. Verma is not maintainable.*

*Vide Full Court resolution dated 19.1.1985 name of Sri S.C. Nigam at Sl. No. 10 and name of Sri R.P. Srivastava at Sl. No. 15 were approved for promotion as temporary Additional District & Sessions Judges, vide Government notification dated 14.6.1985 Sri S.C. Nigam (at Sl. No. 10) and Sri R.P. Srivastava (at Sl. No. 15) were appointed as temporary Additional District & Sessions Judges by the State Government. Thus the name of Sri S.C. Nigam has been placed above Sri R.P. Srivastava. On the ground of later grant of super time scale to Sri S.C. Nigam, his seniority in H.J.S. cadre cannot be taken to be adversely affected. In view of the above, objections of Sri R.P. Srivastava are rejected.*

2. **Sri R.S. Chaubey**, placed at Sl. No. 11 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 994-997 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-01-1985.
  2. He has stated that in O.P. Garg's case and K.N. Singh's case it has been held that Direct Recruits are entitled to seniority from the date of their joining the service and not from any earlier date.
  3. A promotee officer is entitled to seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancy to him within his quota.
  4. Rotation of seniority as prescribed by rule 22 (2) has no importance in the matter of fixation of seniority.
  5. He has requested that in view of above, his seniority be reckoned from 31-1-1985 i.e. the date when substantive vacancy occurred in HJS and became available to him.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Chaubey are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

3. **Sri S.N.H. Zaidi**, placed at Sl. No. 22 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 976-987 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. By the earlier Seniority Committee 04 Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 13 to 16) appointed in Oct. 1985 have not been given placement in the seniority list
  2. For Recruitment batch 1982 only 82 vacancies were determined and 12 were allotted in the quota of Direct Recruits by the earlier Seniority Committee and 10 vacancies were kept reserved for 10 Direct Recruits of 1984 batch.
  3. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 13 to 16) cannot be allotted any vacancy of 1982 or 1984 batch. Therefore, they have to be allotted vacancies out of 1988 batch.
  4. He was promoted to UP HJS on 1986 and he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-5-1985. Therefore, he cannot be placed below 04 Direct Recruits (Sl. No. 13 to 16) of 1982 batch who joined in Oct. 1985.
  5.
    - i. The seniority of the ten Direct Recruits of 1984 Recruitment year is to be determined in accordance with the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in O.P. Garg's case.
    - ii. The persons recruited directly from Bar should get their seniority determined from the date of joining the service irrespective whether their appointment and joining got delayed as a consequence of restraint order.
    - iii. Granting seniority to the Direct Recruits especially of 1984 batch from any date earlier to the date of their joining being prohibited would be violative of directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ram Kishore Gupta's case.
      - a. The promotee has a right to have his seniority counted not from the date of his actual joining on promotion but from the date when a substantive vacancy occurred in his quota according to UP HJS Rules.
      - b. A Direct Recruits has only one date available to him and that is neither the date when the vacancy arose nor the date when it was notified nor even the date when he was selected. **He must be satisfied with the date of his actual appointment for reckoning his seniority and there is no deeming provision to reckon his seniority from any date earlier to his date of appointment i.e. the date of joining.**
      - c. He has requested that his seniority be counted from 31-5-1985 when substantive vacancy occurred in HJS and became available to him

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,7,8 & 12 grounds mentioned by Sri Zaidi are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

4. **Sri Vimal Kishore**, placed at Sl. No. 24 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 276-281 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-5-1985.
  2. He is entitled to get his seniority from 31-5-1985.
  3. Therefore, he has requested that his seniority be fixed from 31-5-1985 (date of vacancy).

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 relevant date for fixing his seniority has been rightly indicated as 25.8.1986. His objections are without merit, hence rejected.*

5. **Sri S.K. Bhatt**, placed at Sl. No. 31 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 304-307 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that seniority list is liable to be prepared keeping in view the directions given by the Division Bench in UP Judicial Services Association case.
2. According to him, U.C. Tiwari & others are not entitled to claim seniority with Direct Recruits of 1982 batch who were earlier appointed.
3. Direct Recruits of 1984 and 1988 batch are also entitled to get seniority from the date of their joining service.
4. Therefore, he has requested that seniority list be prepared accordingly.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Bhatt are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

6. **Sri Sabhapati Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 39 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 785-788 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Substantive vacancy in quota occurred and became available to him on 26-12-1985. Therefore, he being a promotee should be given seniority w.e.f. 26-12-1985.
2.
  - i. The seniority of the ten Direct Recruits of 1984 Recruitment year is to be determined in accordance with the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in O.P. Garg's case.
  - ii. The persons recruited directly from Bar should get their seniority determined from the date of joining the service irrespective whether their appointment and joining got delayed as a consequence of restraint order.
  - iii. Granting seniority to the Direct Recruits especially of 1984 batch from any date earlier to the date of their joining being prohibited would be violative of directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ram Kishore Gupta's case.
  - iv.
    - a. The promotee has a right to have his seniority counted not from the date of his actual joining on promotion but from the date when a substantive vacancy occurred in his quota according to UP HJS Rules.
    - b. A Direct Recruit has only one date available to him and that is neither the date when the vacancy arose nor the date when it was notified nor even the date when he was selected. **He must be satisfied with the date of his actual appointment for reckoning his seniority and there is no deeming provision to reckon his seniority from any date earlier to his date of appointment i.e. the date of joining.**

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Singh are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

7. **Sri Amar Sinha**, placed at Sl. No. 42 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 712-733 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. That he has been wrongly been placed below Sri S.S. Raudra in the TSL. He is senior to Sri Raudra, both have been promoted to UP HJS on 1986, both have been allotted substantive vacancies occurred on 31-12-1985. He was also senior to Sri Raudra in feeder cadre
2. A Direct Recruit has only one date available to him i.e. the date of actual joining and there is no deeming provision to reckon his seniority from any date earlier to his date of joining.
3. A promotee officer is entitled to have his seniority counted not from date of his actual joining but from the date when a substantive vacancy occurred in his quota.
4. He has prayed that he be placed above Sri S.S. Raudra.
5. He has further prayed that he should be given seniority from the date of substantive vacancy i.e. 31-12-1985 made available to him.

*He is a promotee officer. His relevant date for seniority is 28.8.1986. He has been placed at Sl. No. 42 of the TSL below Sri Suraj Singh Raudra, whose relevant date for seniority is also 28.8.1986. According to Sri Sinha he is senior to Sri Raudra in HJS as well as in the feeder cadre. Sri Amar Sinha (Sl. No. 20) and Sri S.S. Raudra (Sl. No. 21) were approved by the Full Court on 17.5.1986. They both were appointed vide Government notification dated 19.8.1986. In this notification name of Sri Amar Sinha finds place at Sl. No. 23 and name of Sri S.S. Raudra at Sl. No. 24. Full Court approved the names of Sri Amar Sinha (Sl. No. 75) and Sri S.S. Raudra (Sl. No. 76) for their substantive appointment in H.J.S. vide Full Court resolution dated 25.7.1992. As discussed above Sri Amar Sinha has been placed above Sri S.S. Raudra at the time of their appointment as temporary Additional District & Sessions Judge as also at the time of their substantive appointment under Rule 22 (1).*

*In view of the above, his request for his placement above Sri S.S. Raudra appears to be correct. To this extent his request is accepted. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 rest of his objections are without substance and rejected. It is directed that in the seniority list he be placed just above Sri S.S. Raudra*

8. **Sri Swatantra Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 43 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 19-28 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Substantive vacancy in quota occurred and became available to him on 31-12-1985. Therefore, he being a promotee should be given seniority w.e.f. 31-12-1985.
2.
  - i. The seniority of the ten Direct Recruits of 1984 Recruitment year is to be determined in accordance with the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in O.P. Garg's case.
  - ii. The persons recruited directly from Bar should get their seniority determined from the date of joining the service irrespective whether their appointment and joining got delayed as a consequence of restraint order.
  - iii. Granting seniority to the Direct Recruits especially of 1984 batch from any date earlier to the date of their joining being prohibited would be violative of Directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ram Kishore Gupta's case.
  - iv.
    - a. The promotee has a right to have his seniority counted not from the date of his actual joining on promotion but from the date when a substantive vacancy occurred in his quota according to UP HJS Rules.
    - b. A Direct Recruit has only one date available to him and that is neither the date when the vacancy arose nor the date when it was notified nor even the date when he was selected. **He must be satisfied with the date of his actual appointment for reckoning his seniority and there is no deeming provision to reckon his seniority from any date earlier to his date of appointment i.e. the date of joining.**

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Singh are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly*

9. **Sri A.K. Rastogi**, placed at Sl. No. 58 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 964 & 1403 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. His date for seniority has been shown as 21-3-1987 in the TSL
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-7-1986.
3. In view of law laid down in O.P. Garg's case he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 31-7-1986 i.e. date of vacancy available to him in his quota.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Rastogi are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

**10. Sri S.A. Siddiqui**, placed at Sl. No. 67 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1064-1065 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Earlier a seniority list of HJS officers was circulated vide letter dated 6-5-1992.
2. The validity of that list was challenged in J.B. Singh's case, K.N. Singh's case and J.C. Gupta's case.
3. All those petitions were dismissed and the seniority list was approved on judicial side.
4. Sri U.C. Tiwari and Sri Nirvikar Gupta had every opportunity to file their objections against the report of the Seniority Committee chaired by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.D. Agarwal, they had also an opportunity to question the final seniority list by filing writ petition but they did not do so, now they cannot be permitted to re-open the seniority matter already settled in the year 1992.
5. Sri U.C. Tiwari and 3 other Direct Recruits have been appointed after appointment of S.N. Singh and others were quashed.
6. Sri U.C. Tiwari and 3 other are not entitled to get seniority with the Direct Recruits of 1982 batch who were appointed earlier.
7. Sri Nirvikar Gupta and 5 other Direct Recruits of 1984 batch are not entitled to get seniority prior to their joining the service. They are not even entitled to be placed in between officers of Nyayik Sewa of 1972 batch.
8. The seniority of HJS Officers should be determined in accordance with several directions given by the Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3 & 8 grounds mentioned by Sri Siddiqui are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly*

**11. Sri Dharam Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 111 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 444-451 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he was promoted to H.J.S. and joined as Additional District Judge on 2.7.1988. Due to non completion of three years qualifying service as Civil Judge he could not be considered for promotion along-with his batch mates. His seniority should be restored and he be placed after the name of Sri K. Z. Khan (Sl. No. 94).
2. He has quoted the instance whereby Sri V.K. Verma was restored his seniority of feeder service in H.J.S. by the earlier Committee.

*Name of Sri Dharam Singh (Sl. No. 44) was approved by the Full Court for his substantive appointment under Rule 22 (1) in H.J.S. on 25.7.1992. Name of Sri K.Z. Khan (Sl. No. 43) was placed above his name and name of Sri Vishwanath Saran Tripathi (Sl. No. 45) was placed below his name in the resolution dated 25.7.1992. Thus his seniority in feeder service has been protected at the time of his approval for substantive appointment. It is also worth mentioning that name of Sri K.Z. Khan finds place in TSL Sl. No. 94 and name of Sri Vishwanath Saran Tripathi finds place at Sl. No. 95, who were promoted as temporary Additional District & Sessions Judges on 26.10.1987 and 31.10.1987 respectively. In view of above and following the past precedent of Sri V.K. Verma request of Sri Dharam Singh for restoring to him seniority of feeder cadre is accepted and his name be placed between Sri K.Z. Khan (Sl. No. 94 of TSL) and Sri Vishwanath Saran Tripathi (Sl. No. 95 of the TSL) in the seniority list.*

**12. Dr. C.D. Rai**, placed at Sl. No. 124 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 757-759 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 10-7-87, one out of 84 posts created under GO dated 10-7-87.
2. These 84 posts were made permanent by the State vide order dated 20-12-1990. Thus these 84 vacancies are substantive in nature as settled by the Apex Court in O.P. Garg's case.

3. He is entitled to reckon his seniority from the date of vacancy i.e. 10-7-87 in view of law laid down in J.B. Singh's case, K.N. Singh's case and O.P. Garg's case.
4. Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in UP JSA's case has observed as under:  
**" The number of the officers of Nyayik Sewa and Judicial Officers Service who were already promoted and appointed against temporary post under Rule 22(3) or 22(4) of the Rules and whose appointments have been protected in O.P. Garg's case would be taken into consideration and the number of vacancies equal to the number of such officers shall be excluded from computation."**

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,5,9 & 12 grounds mentioned by Sri Rai are without substance. His objections are rejected accordingly.*

13. **Sri R.D. Nimesh**, placed at Sl. No. 140 of the TSL as preferred his objections (page No. 1374-1378 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
  1. His name has been placed at Sl. No. 140 and officers (Sl. Nos. 114 to 124) have been placed above him.
  2. These 10 officers have joined the service in the year 1977-78 whereas he has joined the service in the month of April 1975.
  3. These officers have been wrongly placed above him, therefore, he has requested that his name be placed at Sl. No. 114 above these 10 officers.

*The objection raised by Sri Nimesh, relating to his seniority in Nyayik Sewa, has already been settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of State of U.P. Vs. Rafiquddin and others AIR 1988 SC 162.*

*He is claiming seniority above the officers placed at serial numbers 114 to 124 in the TSL. These officers have been officiating in HJS since July 1988 whereas Shri Nimesh has been promoted in HJS in August 1989.*

*In view of the above, objections raised by Shri Nimesh are without substance, hence rejected.*

14. **Sri Virendra Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 148 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 16 & 1016-1017 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
  1. His date of continuous officiation is earlier than officers at Sl. Nos. 134, 136 & 145.
  2. In continuation of his earlier objection dated 17-8-06 he has stated that his name should be placed above Sri V.P. Singh-II.
  3. Keeping in view his date of continuous officiation he be placed senior to the officers at Sl Nos. 134, 136 and 145 of the TSL.
  4. In the column of date of availability of vacancy for Direct Recruits dates have been wrongly shown, they should have been given the date of the year in which the Direct Recruits had joined their service.

*Shri O.P. Mishra (Sl. No.134), Shri M.P.S. Tejan (Sl. No. 136) and Shri Ajay Pal Singh (Sl. No. 145) and the objector (Sl. No. 148) were appointed as temporary Additional District and Sessions Judges by the State Govt. vide notification dated 1-8-1989. In the notification these officers have been placed at Sl no. 1, 3, 14 & 17 respectively. As these four officers have been appointed on the same date and the objector was placed below these three officers, above whom he is claiming seniority, which he cannot.*

*His claim for seniority over V.P. Singh-II (Sl. No. 48) is also without any merit. Shri V.P. Singh-II a Direct Recruit of 1984 batch, who had joined the service on 7-12-86. The objector is more than two and a half years junior to him.*

*In view of the above, objections of Shri Virendra Singh are rejected*

15. **Sri S.K. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 151 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 662-669 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. In UP Nyayik Sewa he was senior to Sri Umesh Chandra-II, Dr. C.D. Rai etc.
2. In the TSL his name has been placed at Sl. No. 151 and his date of continuous officiation in HJS is shown as 22-9-1989 whereas the names of Sri Umesh Chandra-II and Dr. C.D. Rai have been shown at Sl. Nos. 123 and 124 and their dates of continuous officiation has been shown as 2-7-1988 and 4-7-1988, respectively.
3. His promotion in HJS was delayed due to a censor entry dated 22-7-1987 which has become non-existent in view of order of Hon'ble Court dated 8-7-1991 passed in writ petition filed by him.
4. He is entitled to have his seniority of the previous service restored in HJS.
5. He has requested that he may be placed below Sri Shiv Kumar Maurya and above Sri Umesh Chandra-II.

*He is claiming seniority above the officers placed at Sl. Nos. 123 & 124 in the TSL on the basis of his seniority in feeder cadre. He was superseded due to adverse entry at the time, when he was due for promotion. According to him subsequently adverse remark became non-existent. In view of principle No. (iv) adopted the earlier Seniority Committee his request is accepted and he be placed below Sri S.K. Maurya (Sl. No.122) and above Sri Umesh Chandra-II (Sl. No. 123).*

16. **Smt. Jaya Shree Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 211 of the TSL has preferred her objection (page no. 1231 of the compilation) as under:

1. She has been allotted vacancy occurred on 6-7-1990, her seniority in HJS be fixed w.e.f. 6-7-1990 or any earlier date when vacancy is found available for her in view of O.P. Garg's case, S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.

*She has been appointed in HJS vide Govt. notification dated 5-4-1994 and she has joined as such on 12-5-1994. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 her objection is without merit and rejected accordingly.*

17. **Sri S.K. Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 224 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 789-919 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that in O.P. Garg's case and K.N. Singh's case it has been held that Direct Recruits are entitled to seniority from the date of their joining the service and not from any earlier date.
2. A promotee officer is entitled to seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancy to him within his quota.
3. Rotation of vacancy as prescribed by rule 22 (2) has no importance in the matter of fixation of seniority.
4. For determination of seniority of 24 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch they cannot be given benefit of stay order i.e. status quo as there was stay of promotion and appointment of DR in HJS.
5. Direct Recruits have been given vacancies in excess of their quota and as such their total number has become in excess of 15% of total strength as on 31-12-90.
6. Upto 31-12-90 promoted officers have been allotted 26 vacancies less than their quota.
7. Some officers who were not approved for substantive appointment have been wrongly placed in the TSL.
8. Out of 50 posts created on 6-10-82 19 vacancies have not been allotted by the earlier Seniority Committee.
9. Nyayik Sewa is entitled to 13 vacancies out of 19 vacancies.
10. 13 vacancies unnoticed by the earlier Seniority Committee have not been taken into consideration. Nyayik Sewa is entitled to 9 vacancies out of unnoticed 13 vacancies.
11. Guidelines given in UP JSA's case and directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case have been overruled by preparing the TSL.
12. Rule of rotation of vacancies as prescribed in Rule 22 (2) is vague, since it is inconsistent with quota rule.



13. Keeping in view the law laid down in O.P. Garg's case, S.K. Tripathi's case guidelines given in UP JSA's case a draft seniority list have been prepared and enclosed with the representation.
14. He has prayed that TSL may be modified accordingly.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1,2,3,4 & 10 the objections raised by Shri Tripathi appear to be without any substance except ground no. 3 & 4. In draft seniority list prepared by him vacancies have been arbitrarily allocated to give advantage to the promotee officers; which is not permitted by the relevant rules. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

18. **Sri H.N. Mishra**, placed at Sl. No. 242 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 102-103 of the compilation), The ground mentioned by him in brief is as under:

1. He has prayed that Sri V.K. Mathur Direct Recruit of 1988 batch should be allocated vacancy which occurred after 9-11-1992.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 4,5,9 & 10 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

19. **Sri Jitendra Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 282 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 282-292 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he was superseded without any reason when he was due for promotion. He was ultimately promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 25-2-1997. His first prayer is that he should be deemed to have been approved for promotion to the UP HJS on 20-2-88 and promoted in August 1989 along with officers of his batch.
2. In the alternative, he has prayed that he ought to have been placed over and above the officers promoted after 1-4-90 and his seniority be fixed below Sri Chaturbhuj Narain Singh placed at Sl. No. 176.
3. In the last, he has stated that one vacancy in HJS was reserved for him on 18-11-95, therefore, his seniority at least be reckoned from 18-11-95 without any reference to the date of his actual promotion on 20-2-97.
4. In support of his first prayer, he has referred Rule 6 of UP Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991.

*He was inducted in HJS vide Govt. notification dated 20-2-1997; grounds for his earlier supersession have not become non existent. His first two grounds are devoid of any merit.*

*He has requested for notional seniority from 18-11-1995 as one vacancy was kept reserved for his promotion.*

*He was promoted to HJS vide State Govt. notification dated 20-2-1997, in view of decision taken on Issue No. 2 he has been rightly placed in the TSL. His objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

20. **Sri Arvind Kumar Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 283 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 90-99 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He be placed at Sl. No. 253.
2. In alternative, he should be placed below Sri Lalta Prasad and above Sri D.B. Jain (at Sl No. 277).
3. Vacancy for his promotion to HJS became available on 9-12-92 before appointment of 24 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch.
4. He could not be considered for promotion in 1988 Recruitment due to miscalculation of vacancies. The entire exercise of determination of vacancies was held wrong by Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case reported in 2001 (10) SCC page 237.
5. On consideration of his representation one vacancy was kept reserved for him by Full Court resolution dated 18.11.1995 where after he was promoted on 23.2.1997.
6. The appointment by promotion of 13 officers including him was quashed by the High Court in a petition wherein he was not arrayed. Thus the judgment is not binding on him. This judgment stood challenged and reversed by the Apex Court.

7. Vacancies have to be re-determined for each year starting from the Recruitment year 1988 as held in S.K.Tripathi's case.

*He was promoted to HJS vide State Govt. notification dated 20-2-1997, in view of decision taken on Issue No. 2 he has been rightly placed in the TSL. His objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

21. **Sri M.K. Bansal**, placed at Sl. No. 292 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 492-499 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has submitted that Sri A.K. Malviya and 8 other junior officers to him were promoted to HJS in May 1994, he could not be considered for promotion due to adverse remarks.
2. Subsequently, adverse remarks given to him were expunged and he was promoted in HJS in May 1996.
3. He is entitled to have his seniority fixed above Sri Muzaffar Hussain (Sl. No. 245).
4. According to him, UP Govt. Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 will be applicable in the matter of determination of his seniority.
5. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 9-4-1993, he is entitled to reckon his seniority from this date.
6. In the last, he has stated that he could not be placed below Sri Uma Shanker Tomar (Sl. No. 280)

*He has claimed seniority of his feeder service on the basis that he was superseded on account of adverse remarks, which were subsequently expunged. HJS service is not in continuation of Nyayik Sewa. He has become member of HJS vide notification dated 5-12-1998. In view of the above and decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 request of Shri Bansal cannot be accepted, hence rejected.*

*However, his case is similar to Sri S.K. Srivastava, he has been allotted vacancy within quota belonging to Recruitment batch 1990 and he is working as ad-hoc Additional District & Sessions Judge since 10.6.1996. His objections are similarly decided and office is directed to place him accordingly.*

22. **Sri S.K. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 300 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 100-101 of the compilation) as under:

1. He has requested that he may be placed after five Direct Recruits at Sl. No. 253 to 257. According to him Direct Recruits should be placed in the ratio 1:6.

*He was approved for his promotion to HJS under Rule 22(1) vide Full Court resolution dated 18-11-1995 alongwith 12 other officers but he could not be appointed as such because in W.P.No. 36589/ 1995 vide judgment dated 30-6-1998 this Court setaside the recommendation of the Selection Committee dated 2-11-1995 as well as the Full Court resolution dated 18-11-1995 promoting these officers of NS but allowed them to continue on ad-hoc basis, till the Full Court took a decision with regard to direct recruitment. Civil Appeal Nos. 1669- 1680 of 2001 were preferred against the order and judgment dated 30-6-1998. These appeals were decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court alongwith appeal filed by Sri S.K.Tripathi, the Hon'ble Apex Court annulled the determination made by the Full Bench to the effect that for the recruitment of 1990 13 more direct recruits be taken and directed fresh recaluculation of vacancies.*

*Sri S.K. Srivastava has been allotted vacancy with in quota of Nyayik Sewa belonging to*

*Recruitment batch 1990 and he has been working as ad-hoc Additional District & Sessions Judge since 9-6-1996. He was subsequently appointed in HJS vide Government notification dated 5.12.1998. In view of the above, he and similarly situated officers are entitled to get their seniority of Recruitment batch 1990. The objections of Sri S.K. Srivastava are decided accordingly and office is directed to place Sri Srivastava and similarly placed officers in the seniority list counting their seniority from 9.6.96.*

**23. Sri Syed Qutub Uddin**, placed at Sl. No. 304 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1822-1823 of the compilation) as under:

1. He has adopted objections filed by Sri S.K. Tripathi (Sl. No. 224), Sri S.Z. Siddiqui, Sri A.N. Mittal and Sri H.S. Dubey.

*His case is similar to Sri S.K. Srivastava, he has been allotted vacancy within quota belonging to Recruitment batch 1990 and he is working as ad-hoc Additional District & Sessions Judge since 7-6-1996. His objections are similarly decided and office is directed to place him accordingly.*

**24. Sri Subodh Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 308 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1084-1130 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 21-10-1994, he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 10-06-1996 and he has been appointed under Rule 22 (2) in December 1998.
2. While preparing the tentative seniority list the vacancies have not been calculated in accordance with law and pronouncement of the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. If vacancies are to be calculated in accordance with law the objecting requestor will be entitled for vacancy occurred prior to 31-12-92. Therefore, he is entitled to be deemed to have been promoted from the date when the vacancy was available (prior to 31-12-92) to him in his quota.
3. He has further requested that he be placed in the seniority list above the first Direct Recruit of 1988 batch Sri V.K. Mathur.
4. His appointment in HJS in 1996 was challenged on the judicial side, the writ petition filed by the candidate Direct Recruit was allowed by the Hon'ble Court and appointment of objecting requestor was quashed. After that he was re-appointed under Rule 22 (1) in Recruitment batch 1992 to 1994 and notification in respect of his appointment was issued on 5-12-98.
5. The objecting requestor had filed SLP against the judgment dated 30-6-98. His SLP was decided along with civil appeal no. 5908 of 1997 S.K. Tripathi Vs. State of UP. The Hon'ble Apex Court held that calculation of vacancies made by the Hon'ble Court was wrong, therefore directed for fresh exercise in respect of calculation of vacancies. As the judgment of the Hon'ble Court dated 30-6-98, whereby the appointment of objecting requestor in HJS was quashed has been set aside by the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case, consequently appointment of the objecting requestor under Rule 22 (2) against the substantive vacancy in 1990 Recruitment should be restored. Thus, his actual date of substantive appointment should be 30-7-1996.

*His case is similar to Sri S.K. Srivastava, he has been allotted vacancy within quota belonging to Recruitment batch 1990 and he is working as ad-hoc Additional District & Sessions Judge since 10-9-1996. His objections are similarly decided and office is directed to place him accordingly.*

**25. Sri Prabhu Ji**, placed at Sl. No. 345 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1816-1821 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 21-10-1994, he joined HJS on 10-06-1996 but his seniority has been counted from December 1998. His appointment under Rule 22 (3) was a regular appointment.
2. His seniority should be determined as per unamended Rule 26 of HJS Rules and UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991.

3. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
4. 29 Direct Recruits who joined the service in August 1996, August 1997 and December 1998 have been wrongly placed above him.
5. He has requested that his seniority be counted w.e.f. 21-10-1994 i.e. the date of vacancy available to him and his continuous officiation from 10-6-1996 also be taken into consideration for computing his seniority and he be placed above the aforesaid 29 Direct Recruits.
6. He has requested that his seniority be fixed either from the date of vacancy i.e. 21-10-94 or at the most from 27-5-96 i.e. the date of notification.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

26. **Sri V.B. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 348 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1391-1394 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 21-10-1994, he joined HJS on 10-06-1996 but his seniority has been counted from December 1998. His appointment under Rule 22 (3) was a regular appointment.
2. His seniority should be determined as per unamended Rule 26 of HJS Rules and UP Government Servant Seniority Rules 1991.
3. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
4. 29 Direct Recruits who joined the service in August 1996, August 1997 and December 1998 have been wrongly placed above him.
5. He has requested that his seniority be counted w.e.f. 21-10-1994 i.e. the date of vacancy available to him and his continuous officiation from 10-6-1996 also be taken into consideration for computing his seniority and he be placed above the aforesaid 29 Direct Recruits.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

27. **Sri D.N. Agarwal**, placed at Sl. No. 349 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1625-1628 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 21-10-1994, he joined HJS on 10-06-1996 but his seniority has been counted from December 1998. His appointment under Rule 22 (3) was a regular appointment.
2. His seniority should be determined as per unamended Rule 26 of HJS Rules and UP Government Servant Seniority Rules 1991.
3. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
4. 29 Direct Recruits who joined the service in August 1996, August 1997 and December 1998 have been wrongly placed above him.
5. He has requested that his seniority be counted w.e.f. 21-10-1994 i.e. the date of vacancy available to him and his continuous officiation from 10-6-1996 also be taken into consideration for computing his seniority and he be placed above the aforesaid 29 Direct Recruits.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**28. Sri S.Z. Siddiqui**, placed at Sl. No. 350 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1537-1541 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was eligible for promotion in HJS on 7-5-1990 but he was promoted to HJS on 7-6-1996 for none of his fault.
2. In Recruitment batch 1988 only 5 Direct Recruits could have been appointed whereas 24 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota.
3. Direct Recruits have been allotted vacancies in excess of their quota and ceiling prescribed by Rule 8 (2).
4. UP Govt. Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been followed. Neither direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case has been complied with.
5. Law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rudra Kumar Sain's case has not been taken into consideration.
6. According to his calculation, vacancy was available for him in the year 1992 but he was not promoted and he has been wrongly allotted vacancy occurred on 21-10-94. Principle of rota and quota as prescribed in R.K. Sabharwal's case has not been followed.
7. Therefore, he has requested that his seniority be fixed from the date vacancy was available to him.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of proviso to Rule 22 (3). In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**29. Sri A.N. Mittal**, placed at Sl. No. 351 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 309-319 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that period of continuous officiation in HJS must be counted for seniority.
2. He has further stated that old vacancies must be governed by old rules and in absence of any rules, residuary rules will apply.
3. He has further stated that while allocating vacancies and fixing seniority in the TSL, direction nos. 2 and 3 of the case of S.K. Tripathi Vs. State of UP 2001 (6) Supreme 817 and directions given in UP Judicial Officers' Association Vs. State of UP decided on 25-8-04 have not been followed.
4. According to him, provisions of Rule 3 of UP Government Servants' Seniority Rules, 1991 have overriding effect. The amended Rules 26 in contradiction with the aforesaid Rules but cannot be implemented.
5. According to him, amendment in HJS Rules in 1996 and directions given in O.P. Garg's case will operate prospectively.
6. According to him, while preparing TSL ceiling as provided by proviso to Rule 8(2) has been violated.
7. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed either from the date of vacancy or from 7-6-96 (date of continuous officiation).

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in the TSL in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority*

*Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4 & 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**30. Sri R.S. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 356 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1071-1074 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 24-1-97 and he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (1) in December 1998. He has allotted vacancy occurred on 31-1-95. In Recruitment batch 1998 only 9 Direct Recruits could have been appointed in view of first proviso to Rule 8 (2), prior to amendment in Feb. 1996 as held in WP No. 316 of 2004 judgement dated 3-2-2004.
2. In 1988 Recruitment batch 335 vacancies should have been allocated to UP NS, against this number only 262 officers were promoted. Thus 68 vacancies remained unfilled in the quota of promotees. As such the objecting requestor was entitled to be promoted in 1988 Recruitment year in view of direction no. 3 made by Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case.
3. In K.N. Singh's case it has been held that for fixing seniority a Direct Recruit has only one date available to him i.e. the date of joining. A promotee officer is entitled to have his seniority counted not from the date of his actual joining but from the date when substantive vacancy occurs in his quota.
4. Therefore, he has requested that in view of the direction in S.K. Tripathi's case he be deemed to have been promoted in the Recruitment batch 1988 and he be placed above the first Direct Recruit of 1988 batch.

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**31. Sri A.K. Agarwal-II**, placed at Sl. No. 358 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1148-1169 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancies occurred on 9-2-1995 and from this date he is entitled for promotion in UP HJS.
2. He was promoted to UP HJS in 1996 and joined as ADJ on 13-6-1996.
3. Since vacancy was available to him and he was promoted after following the prescribed procedure and he has been continuously working since 13-6-1996, his seniority at least should be counted from 13-6-1996.
4. Principle of old vacancy- old rule should be followed in his case
5. UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 have overriding effect in view of Rule 3 as settled by Hon'ble Apex Court in Mohan Kumar Vs. State of UP 1998 (2) SLR SC6.
6. 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch should be pushed down in seniority list in view of directions made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case
7. 13 vacancies unnoticed by the earlier Seniority Committee should be included in the calculation of vacancies for preparing the TSL.
8. 30 officers of NS have been wrongly allotted vacancies of the year 1989 and 1990 instead of 1988.
9. 33 Direct Recruits have been wrongly placed together without corresponding placement of promotee officers.
10. O.P. Garg's case is to operate prospectively and temporary vacancies created till the date (23-4-1991) and occupied by the promotee officers have been wrongly allotted to the Direct Recruits in the TSL.
11. Seniority of promotee officers be counted from the date of substantive vacancy in the quota or at least from the date of continuous officiation as ADJ.
12. He has requested that he be given an opportunity of personal hearing before finalization of seniority list.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for*

*regulating conditions of service of judicial officers. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1 to 5 & 10, his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**32. Sri Vimla Prasad**, placed at Sl. No. 360 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 772-783 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS on 27-5-1996 and joined as ADJ on 10-6-96.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 24-2-95. He has been given seniority in HJS from 14-12-98 after two and half years continuous officiation.
3. 29 Direct Recruits who have joined the service after him have been shown senior to him.
4. Amendment in Rule 26 in 1996 are not in consonance with the directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court given in O.P. Garg's case.
5. While framing new Rule 26 UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been kept in mind.
6. Seniority should have been determined on the principle of old vacancy- old Rules.
7. New Rule 22 (3) and amended Rule 26 deserve to be ignored being violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution.
8. 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have to be pushed down as these appointments were made in excess of the quota for Direct Recruits.
9. Directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case or guidelines given in UP Judicial Service Association's case have not been considered while preparing the TSL.
10. O.P. Garg's case is to operate prospectively.
11. Seniority of promotee officers in HJS shall be counted from the date of substantive vacancy made available in their quota or at least from the date of their continuous officiation.
12. His ad-hoc service may not be ignored for determination of his seniority.
13. The final seniority list be prepared accordingly

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5, his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**33. Sri Bankey Lal Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 361 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1080-1083 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 24-1-97 and he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (1) in December 1998. He has allotted vacancy occurred on 31-1-95. In Recruitment batch 1998 only 9 Direct Recruits could have been appointed in view of first proviso to Rule 8 (2), existing prior to amendment in Feb. 1996 as held in WP No. 316 of 2004 judgement dated 3-2-2004.
2. In 1988 Recruitment batch 335 vacancies should have been allocated to UP NS, against this number only 262 officers were promoted. Thus 68 vacancies remained unfilled in the quota of promotees. As such the objecting requestor was entitled to be promoted in 1988 Recruitment year. In view of direction no. 3 made by Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case.
3. In K.N. Singh's case it has been held that for fixing seniority a Direct Recruit has only one date available to him i.e. the date of joining. A promotee officer is entitled to have his seniority counted not from the date of his actual joining but from the date when substantive vacancy occurs in his quota.
4. Therefore, he has requested that in view of the direction in S.K. Tripathi's case he be deemed to have been promoted in the Recruitment batch 1988 and he be placed above the first Direct Recruit of 1988 batch.

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by*

*the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**34. Sri O.P. Verma**, placed at Sl. No. 365 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 265-268 of the compilation) as under:

1. He has requested that his seniority may be fixed above the Direct Recruit at Sl. No. 260. According to him, vacancy for his promotion in HJS was available on 28-2-95 and as per HJS Rules prevailing on that date promoted officers were to be treated as senior to Direct Recruits. But Direct Recruits appointed in HJS in May 1994, August 1996, August 1997 and December 1998 have been placed above him.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**35. Sri J.K. Goel**, placed at Sl. No. 369 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1192-1196 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 15-3-1995.
2. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from 15-3-1995 ( the date of vacancy) or 18-11-1995 (vacancy reserved) or alternatively from 24-5-1997 ( the date of approval) or 25-10-97 (the date of continuous officiation) or at least from 5-12-1998 the date of joining under Rule 22).
3. He has stated that principle of old vacancy-old rule should be followed in his case.
4. While preparing the TSL directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case have not been complied with.
5. In view of O.P. Garg's case he is entitled to get seniority from the date of his continuous officiation.
6. In view of law laid down Rudra Kumar Sain's case his ad-hoc service may not be ignored while determining his seniority.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of proviso to Rule 22(3). In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**36. Sri B.P. Vishwakarma**, placed at Sl. No. 370 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1950-1953 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been drawn erroneously and Direct Recruits have been grouped together irrespective of their quota.
2. 17 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in 1988 batch, 5 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in 1990 batch, 4 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in Special Recruitment Drive in the year 1997.
3. After adjusting aforesaid Direct Recruits in Recruitment batch 1994 batch only 3 Direct Recruits could have been appointed and remaining 17 could have been adjusted in Recruitment 2000 appointed in 2005.
4. Seniority list should have been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case. and guidelines given in UP JSA's case.
5. He has requested that TSL be quashed and a fresh seniority list be prepared.

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*



37. **Sri T.M. Khan**, placed at Sl. No. 374 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1066-1070 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-5-1995. Therefore, he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 31-5-1995.
2. In the alternative, he has stated that in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is at least entitled to get his seniority reckoned from 18-11-1995 i.e. the date he was approved for promotion to HJS.
3. In the last, he has stated that he was promoted in HJS as stop gap arrangement on 20-1-1997 and he continued to work on the post regularly till he was appointed substantively on 5-12-1998.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

38. **Sri A.K. Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 377 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1763-1769 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-6-1995 and from this date he is entitled for promotion in UP HJS.
2. He was promoted to UP HJS in 1996 and joined as ADJ on 28-10-97.
3. Since vacancy was available to him and he was promoted after following the prescribed procedure and he has been continuously working since 28-10-97, his seniority at least should be counted from 28-10-97.
4. Principle of old vacancy- old rule should be followed in his case.
5. UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 have overriding effect in view of Rule 3 as settled by Hon'ble Apex Court in Mohan Kumar Vs. State of UP 1998 (2) SLR SC6.
6. 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch should be pushed down in seniority list in view of directions made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's' case
7. 13 vacancies unnoticed by the earlier Seniority Committee should be included in the calculation of vacancies for preparing the TSL.
8. 30 officers of NS have been wrongly allotted vacancies of the year 1989 and 1990 instead of 1988.
9. 33 Direct Recruits have been wrongly placed together without corresponding placement of promotee officers.
10. O.P. Garg's case is to operate prospectively and temporary vacancies created till the date (23-4-1991) and occupied by the promotee officers have been wrongly allotted to the Direct Recruits in the TSL.
11. Seniority of promotee officers be counted from the date of substantive vacancy in the quota or at least from the date of continuous officiation as ADJ.
12. He has requested that he be given an opportunity of personal hearing before finalization of seniority list.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. U.P. Govt. Servant. Seniority Rules, 1991 have not been made in consultation with the High Court, which is a mandatory requirement for regulating conditions of service of judicial officers. In view of decision taken by the committee on Issue Nos. 1 to 5 & 10, his objections are without substance hence, rejected.*

39. **Sri Anurag Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 381 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1059-1062 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS in Oct. 1995 and joined on 27-10-1997.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 19-7-1995.
3. He was approved for promotion in UP HJS in Nov. 1995.
4. Since vacancy allotted to him has occurred prior to 23-2-1996, this vacancy required to be filled up in accordance with old rules.

5. In case of his promotion in HJS expression "ad-hoc stop gap" will have not effect and his promotion will be deemed to have been made under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. date of his approval (direction no. 3 of S.K. Tripathi's case).
6. He has prayed that he be placed above all those officers who have been appointed and joined the service after Nov. 1995.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

40. **Sri B.K. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 384 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 927 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-07-1995.
  2. He was promoted to HJS in Oct. 1997.
  3. He is entitled to get his seniority determined from the date of availability of vacancy i.e. 31-7-1995.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

41. **Sri Subhash Chandra-II (Batra)**, placed at Sl. No. 385 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1458-1459 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-7-1995, he was approved for promotion to UP HJS under Rule 20 (1) vide Full Court Resolution dated Nov. 1995.
  2. He was promoted in HJS under Rule 22 (3) in Oct. 1997 and under Rule 22 (1) in Dec. 1998.
  3. In view of direction in S.K. Tripathi's case, he will be deemed to have been promoted under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. Nov. 1995.
  4. Direct Recruits Sri D.B. Jain and four others have been approved in Nov. 1995 and in violation of unamended Rule 26 they have been placed above the objector.
  5. Direct Recruits Sri Naresh Singh and three others appointed in 1997 and Sri Manoj Kumar Singhal and 19 others appointed in 1998 have been placed above the objector.
  6. In view of S.K. Tripathi's case, the objector is entitled to be placed above all the aforesaid Direct Recruits.
  7. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of proviso to Rule 22(3). In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 10 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

42. **Sri B.R. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 386 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 77-79 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:
1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.07.1995, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rule 22(1) on November 1995.

2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) in 24.10.1997 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22(1) in December 1998.
3. In view of S.K. Tripathi's case and Rudra Kumar Sain's case, he should be deemed to have been promoted under Rule 22(1) from November 1995.
4. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the date of his approval i.e. November 1995.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of proviso to Rule 22(3). In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

43. **Sri Bharat Bhushan**, placed at Sl. No. 392 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 484-490 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted as Additional District Judge in October 1997.
2. Vacancy occurred on 30.09.1995 has been allotted to him.
3. He is entitled to get his seniority determined according to Rule 26(un-amended)
4. Appointment of 17 Direct Recruits in 1994 have been held to be irregular.
5. In view of settled legal position he is entitled to be treated senior to Direct Recruits who joined service in 1994, 1996, 1997 and 1998.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process for his Recruitment batch.*

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

44. **Sri Z.U. Khan**, placed at Sl. No. 394 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 50-51 & 645-646 of the compilation) as under:

1. He has requested that date of availability of substantive vacancy i.e. 31-12-95 for his promotion in HJS be treated as date relevant for fixation of seniority.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

45. **Sri S.K. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 397 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1666-1667 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 18-1-96, he has joined HJS on 4-4-1998.
2. His seniority has been determined under amended Rule 26 whereas his appointment had been made against the vacancy occurred on 18-01-96.
3. Principle of old vacancy-old rule will be applicable in his case and he is entitled to get seniority from the date of continuous officiation.
4. He has requested that he be placed above the Direct Recruits who have joined after 4-4-98.

*He has been promoted to HJS on 5-12-1998. For this recruitment advertisement was published in June 1996 under Rule 17 (1) of HJS Rules. He has been placed in accordance with Rules existing at the time of initiation of process of his Recruitment batch.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

46. **Sri V.S. Rana**, placed at Sl. No. 400 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1857-1862 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.1.96, he is working in HJS from 1-4-98 and -12-98
2. His seniority should be counted from 31.1.96 as held in O.P. Garg's case.
3. He was approved for promotion in 1995 in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to be promoted from 31.1.96.
4. Direct Recruits who were appointed after 31-3-98 (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto Sl. No. 323) have been wrongly placed above him.
5. Direct Recruits of 1988 batch and of all subsequent batches if found appointed in excess of their quota they are to be down placed.
6. These Direct Recruits are not entitled to be grouped together.
7. He has requested that his seniority be re-fixed accordingly.

*As per TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 10 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

47. **Sri Sunil Kumar Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 403 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 271-273 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he was promoted under Rule 22 (1) to UP HJS on 11-12-1998. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 22-3-1996. In view of settled legal position, he is entitled for promotion from that date.
2. He has requested that his seniority be fixed w.e.f. 22-3-1996 (date of vacancy).

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

48. **Sri Arun Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 404 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1837-1844 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS in Dec. 1998 and joined as ADJ on 16-12-98.
2. Seniority of HJS officers is to be determined under Rule 26 on the basis of rotational appointment under Rule 22 (2).
3. Provisions of Rule 22 (2) are violative of Art. 14 and 16. Consequently, provisions of Rule 26 are also violative of Art. 14 and 16.
4. The TSL has been prepared without considering directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines given in UP JSA's case.
5. UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 are applicable to HJS officers also in view of Rule 3.
6. He has requested that his seniority be re-considered in the light of submission made above.

*So far as ground No. 3 is concerned, constitutionality of the Rules will be examined on judicial side, the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing Rules governing seniority. Regarding ground No. 5 it has been held earlier that the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The ground mentioned at No. 4 is also without substance. The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Grounds mentioned by the objector are without substance and disposed of accordingly.*

49. **Sri L.P. Pandey-I**, placed at Sl. No. 410 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1268-1269 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 14-07-1996.
2. He has been promoted to UP HJS 12-12-1998
3. As held in O.P. Garg's case and K.N. Singh's case seniority of Direct Recruits shall be counted from the date of their joining the service and seniority of promoted officers shall be counted from the date of availability of vacancy within their quota.
4. He had requested that his seniority be fixed according to law stated above.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**50. Sri Dilip Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 411 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1270-1290 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has been allotted vacancy arose on 15-7-1996 as such he was entitled to promotion to UP HJS from that date.
2. He was promoted to HJS on 11-12-1998. His promotion was delayed for reasons not attributable to him as such he cannot be deprived of his seniority w.e.f. 15-7-1996.
3. Validity of amended rule 26 is under challenge before the Hon'ble Court in WP No. 2011 (S/B) of 1999 and WP No. 834 (S/B) of 2006.
4. Provisions of amended rules 26 are violative of provisions of Rule 3 and Rule 8 of UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991. By virtue of Rule 3 of Seniority Rules the provisions of amended rule will not be applicable for determination of seniority of the objecting requestor.
5. The TSL has been prepared without complying with the directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court made in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines given by the Hon'ble Court in UP JSA's case
6. He has requested that his seniority be counted from the date of vacancy i.e. 15-07-1996 was made available to him.

*Constitutionality of the Rules will be examined on judicial side, the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing Rules governing seniority. It has been held earlier that the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 13 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**51. Sri Vijay Verma**, placed at Sl. No. 413 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1170-1190 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has been allotted vacancy arose on 31-7-1996 as such he was entitled to promotion to UP HJS from that date.
2. He was promoted to HJS on 11-12-1998. His promotion was delayed for reasons not attributable to him as such he cannot be deprived of his seniority w.e.f. 31-7-1996.
3. Validity of amended rule 26 is under challenge before the Hon'ble Court in WP No. 2011 (S/B) of 1999 and WP No. 834 (S/B) of 2006.
4. Provisions of amended Rule 26 are violative of provisions of Rule 3 and Rule 8 of UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991. As by virtue of Rule 3 of Seniority Rules the provisions of amended rule will not be applicable for determination of seniority of the objecting requestor.
5. The TSL has been prepared without complying with the directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court made in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines given by the Hon'ble Court in UP JSA's case
6. He has requested that his seniority be counted from 31-7-1996 i.e. the date of availability of vacancy.

*Constitutionality of the Rules will be examined on judicial side, the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing Rules governing seniority. It has been held earlier that the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 13 cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**52. Sri D.K. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 415 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1452 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Direct Recruits have not been placed in TSL as per quota rota rule.
2. He was promoted to HJS in clear vacancy between years 1992 to 1994, he has been wrongly allotted vacancy occurred on 12-8-1996.
3. He has requested that seniority list be revised accordingly.

*He has been promoted in Recruitment Batch-1992-1994, whose block period ends on 31.12.1997, he has been allotted vacancy relating to his Recruitment batch. In view of the above and decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 and 10, his request cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed accordingly.*

**53. Sri A.K. Srivastava-II**, placed at Sl. No. 416 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1730-1731 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. 11-7-98, his date of appointment has been wrongly shown as "6-2003".
2. In S.K. Tripathi's case it has been settled that there were only 5 vacancies for Direct Recruitment in the year 1988
3. In pursuance of Direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case it was necessary to calculate the number of vacancies available to Direct Recruits in Recruitment batch 1988.
4. He has requested that his date of appointment be corrected accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 4 & 5, his ground Nos.2 & 3 are without substance, hence rejected.*

*He has also requested for correction of date of appointment mentioned in column no. 3 of the TSL. His date of appointment has been shown as "6-2003", according to him he has been appointed w.e.f. 11-07-1998.*

*He has been given appointment with deemed date i.e. 11.7.98, in view of his appointment order vide Government notification dated 20.6.2003, TSL be corrected as prayed by him.*

**54. Km. Sudha Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 421 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 2025-2030 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. Seniority list has not been prepared in accordance with directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in JSA's case.
2. Recruitment for various batches from 1988 have not commenced within the time framed prescribed by the Rules.
3. Recruitment from the bar has been made in excess of their quota in various recruitment from 1988 batch and onward, whereas promotion from UP Nyayik Sewa has not been made to fill vacancies available in the quota of NS.
4. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto 327) have been wrongly placed above the officers of NS.
5. All vacancies existing before 1988 should have been filled up from the promotees.
6. She has been allotted vacancy occurred on 10.11.1996 and she was approved for promotion on 11-7-1998.
7. She has been promoted under Rule 22 (1) in December 1998.
8. She has prayed that her seniority be fixed as per directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and she should be deemed to have been promoted on 10.11.1996.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5, 10 & 13 her request for seniority cannot be accepted. Her objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**55. Sri Ram Kumar Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 425 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 274-275 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-11-1996. He was promoted to UP HJS on 16-2-99, he is entitled for promotion on 30-11-1996.
2. He has requested that his seniority be reckoned from the date of availability of vacancy i.e. 30-11-1996.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**56. Sri D.N. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 426 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1673-1676 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 2-1-1997, he was promoted under Rule 22 (3) on 18-2-1999 but he has been given seniority from 26-5-05 meaning thereby his services between 18-2-1999 to 26-5-2005 have not been taken into consideration.
2. In S.K. Tripathi's case it has been held that seniority of promotee officers should be determined from the date of vacancy occurred in his quota.
3. Existing Rule 22 (2) and 26 ought to be amended and vacancy should be allotted in the ratio of 85:15 for NS and DR. This submission is fortified from the view expressed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.S. Mahal's case.
4. He has requested that he be deemed to have been promoted from 2-1-97 and his seniority be determined accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 10 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**57. Sri Rahul Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 428 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2007 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 3.2.97. Therefore, he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 3.2.97.
2. In the alternative, he has stated that in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is at least entitled to get his seniority reckoned from 18-11-1995 i.e. the date he was approved for promotion to HJS.
3. In the last, he has stated that he was promoted to HJS as stop gap arrangement on 25.5.99 and he continued to work on the post regularly till he was appointed substantively on 20.5.2005.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed accordingly.*

**58. Sri Yogesh Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 435 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1957-1959 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 7.4-1997, he was approved for promotion to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 11-7-1998.
2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 19-2-1999, he was appointed in HJS in May 2005 under Rule 22 (1).
3. In view of Direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case and law down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case he should be deemed to have been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) from the date of his approval i.e. 11-7-1998.
4. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

59. **Sri R.A. Kaushik**, placed at Sl. No. 442 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 697-701 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted as ADJ on 12-2-1999
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 25-07-1997. Therefore, he was eligible for promotion on 25-07-1997.
3. His seniority has been fixed from May 2005 after continuous officiation of six years and three months.
4. For Recruitment batch 1988, 25 Direct Recruits were recommended to be appointed. Direct Recruits appointed in excess of vacancies have to be pushed down in the seniority list in view of law laid down in K.N. Singh's case and direction no. 3 of S.K. Tripathi's case as well as guideline no. 3 of the Hon'ble Court in UP J.S.A.'s case. He be deemed to have been promoted on 25-07-1997 i.e. date of vacancy.
5. He has requested that he be placed before Sri Naresh Singh (Sl. No. 284).

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4 & 5 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

60. **Sri Ambrish Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 447 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2021-2024 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 8-9-97.
2. In S.K. Tripathi's case it has been held that seniority of promotee officers should be determined from the date of vacancy occurred in his quota.
3. Existing Rule 22 (2) and 26 ought to be amended and vacancy should be allotted in the ratio of 85:15 for NS and DR. This submission is fortified from the view expressed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.S. Mahal's case.
4. He is entitled to be promoted from 8-9-1997 and Direct Recruits who have joined service after that date be placed below him.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 & 10 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

61. **Sri Subhash Chandra-III**, placed at Sl. No. 448 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page no. 1975 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 8-9-1997, he was promoted to HJS on 16-2-1999 but he has been given seniority from 19-5-2005.
2. He has requested that he be given seniority from 16-2-1999.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

62. **Sri S.K. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 452 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1246-1251 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Seniority list has not been prepared in accordance with directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in JSA's case.
2. Recruitment for various batches from 1988 have not commenced within the time framed prescribed by the Rule.
3. Recruitment from the bar has been made in excess of their quota in various recruitment from 1988 batch and onward, whereas promotion from UP Nyayik Sewa has not been made to fill the vacancies available in the quota of NS.
4. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto 327) have been wrongly placed above the officers of NS.
5. All vacancies existing before 1988 should have been filled up from the promotees.
6. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 8-9-1997 and he was approved for promotion on 11-7-1998.
7. He should have been promoted in December 1998.
8. His appointment under Rule 22 (3) appears to be wrong and he is entitled to have been promoted and appointed in previous recruitment and his seniority should be counted from the date where vacancy was available to him i.e. 8-9-1997.
9. In view of Rudra Kumar Sain's case his ad-hoc service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored while fixing the seniority.
10. Determination of seniority as per rotational appointment under Rule 22 (2) is against justice and equity and all posts of DJ should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.



11. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed according to law and he should be given an opportunity of personal hearing.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Raudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3).*

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5,10 & 13 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

63. **Sri Deepak Kumar** (TSL No. 454), **Sri Abhai Kumar** (TSL No. 509), **Sri Indrajeet Verma** (TSL No. 544), **Sri R.P. Singh** (TSL No. 578), **Sri K.P. Singh** (TSL No. 662), **Sri S.N. Agnihotri** (TSL No. 668), **Sri A.K. Saxena** (TSL No. 704), **Sri U.C. Tripathi** (TSL No. 713), **Sri S.K. Vishwakarma**, **Sri J.K. Tiwari**, **Sri America Singh**, **Sri Subedar Yadav**, **Sri R.N. Pandey**, **Smt. Sangeeta Srivastava**, **Sri Ajay Kumar Srivastava** have preferred their objections (page nos. 702-711 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by them in brief are as under:

1. They have adopted the representation dated 10-07-06 made by Sri S.K. Tripathi, President, UP Judicial Services Association. Main grounds of the representation are as follows:-
  - i. That earlier seniority list prepared by the Seniority Committee was circulated by Court's letter dated 6-5-1992.
  - ii. The earlier seniority list was challenged by Sri J.B. Singh and others before Hon'ble Court, Lucknow Bench in WP No. 3054/1992 which was ultimately dismissed.
  - iii. The Direct Recruits also challenged that list in WP No. 33297/1992 K.N. Singh Vs. State of UP and others and WP No. 3082/92 J.C. Gupta and another Vs. State of UP. These petitions were also dismissed by five Judges' Bench on 12-01-99.
  - iv. According to these decisions, it is well settled that Direct Recruit is not entitled for seniority from a date prior to his date of joining the service. The date of vacancy available to a Direct Recruit has no relevance in the matter of seniority.
  - v. Seniority rule was amended w.e.f. 23-2-1996.
  - vi. Vacancies occurred in the service prior to the said date are to be filled in accordance with Rules as applicable prior to the amendment
  - vii. After amendment of Rule 26 in 1996, Rule 22 (2) has not been amended, which provides for rotation of vacancies in the ratio 50:50 which is not in conformity with the quota of respective sources i.e. 85:15. According to the Apex Court in P.S. Mahal's case roster has to be in conformity with quota rule.
  - viii. Request has been made that officers appointed on vacancies occurred prior to amendment of Rules are entitled to get their seniority determined as per Rule 26 (unamended) and officers appointed on vacancies occurred after 23-2-1996 are entitled to get the roster be prepared in accordance with the quota of 85:15 as contemplated by Rule 6.

*In P. Mohan Reddy Vs. E.A.A. Charles AIR 2001 Supreme Court Page 1210 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has made the following observation: -*

***"A conspectus of the aforesaid decisions of this Court would indicate that even though an employee cannot claim to have a vested right to have a particular position in any grade, but all the same he has the right of his seniority being determined in accordance with the Rules which remained in force at the time when he was borne in the cadre."***

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3 and 10 grounds raised by the objectors appear to be without substance. Rest of the grounds*

*stands answered by the observation quoted above. Thus their objections are devoid of merit and disposed of accordingly.*

**64. Sri A.K. Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 455 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1216 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS in Feb. 1999.
2. While fixing the seniority, period from 13-2-1999 to May 2005 has not been taken into consideration.
3. His seniority has not been fixed as per directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed from the date of availability of vacancy in quota for him.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**65. Sri V.K. Tyagi**, placed at Sl. No. 462 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 262-264 of the compilation) as under:

1. He has stated that in the TSL his date of joining under Rule 22 (1) has been wrongly shown as 21-8-05 instead of 21-5-05. He is working as Additional District & Sessions Judge on ad-hoc basis since February 1999. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 8-9-1997. Therefore, he may be treated as promoted under Rule 22(1) w.e.f. 20-2-99 and his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His Objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**66. Sri U.S. Awasthi**, placed at Sl. No. 464 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 47-49 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has requested that date of availability of substantive vacancy i.e. 8-9-97 for his promotion to HJS be treated as date relevant for fixation of seniority.
2. He further requested that his service in HJS cadre from the year 1999 to 2005 be also taken in consideration for fixation of his seniority.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**67. Sri A.K. Rastogi-II**, placed at Sl. No. 468 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2042-2044 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been drawn erroneously and Direct Recruits have been grouped together irrespective of their quota.
2. 17 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in 1988 batch, 5 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in 1990 batch, 4 Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota in Special Recruitment Drive in the year 1997.
3. After adjusting aforesaid Direct Recruits in Recruitment batch 1992-1994 only 3 Direct Recruits could have been appointed and remaining 17 could have been adjusted in Recruitment 2000 appointed in 2005.
4. Seniority list should have been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines given in UP JSA's case.
5. He has requested that TSL be quashed and a fresh seniority list be prepared.

*In the TSL ceiling prescribed by proviso to Rule 8 (2) has not been violated. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 10 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**68. Sri G.N. Sinha**, placed at Sl. No. 470 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1204-1205 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-09-97.
2. He has joined on 26-5-05 pursuant to his promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1).

3. His service in HJS from 12-2-99 to 25-5-05 has been ignored while fixing the seniority w.e.f. 26-5-05.
4. He has prayed that his seniority be counted since 12-2-99 i.e. the date he was promoted to HJS.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

- 69. Sri Ahmad Naseem**, placed at Sl. No. 472 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 694-696 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted substantive vacancy occurred on 12-09-1997.
2. He was approved for promotion to UP HJS on 11-07-1998.
3. He was promoted to UP HJS on Feb. 1999 under Rule 22(3).
4. In view of Apex Court direction in S.K. Tripathi's case he shall be deemed to have been appointed in UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. 11-07-1998.
5. His service from Feb. 1999 to May 2005 may not be ignored in view of Hon'ble Apex Court's pronouncement in Rudra Kumar Sain's case.
6. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

- 70. Sri B.C. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 475 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2018 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Spelling of his name has not been shown correctly in the TSL.
2. TSL has not been prepared according to direction in S.K. Tripathi's case.
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-97. He has been promoted to HJS on 12-2-1999.
4. he has requested that he must be treated to be promoted under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. 12-2-99. and his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

- 71. Sri P.K. Srivastava-I**, placed at Sl. No. 478 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1932-1934 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been drawn in contravention of HJS Rules.
2. Appointments of 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have been made in excess of their quota.
3. The TSL should have been prepared in accordance with in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. He has requested that TSL be quashed and fresh seniority list be prepared.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 objections of Shri Srivastava are without substance, hence rejected.*

- 72. Sri Jai Jai Ram Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 479 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2034-2039 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-1997, he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 16-2-99 and he was appointed under Rule 22 (1) on 17-5-05.
2. He is entitled to get this promotion with effect from 12-9-1997, in view of direction of the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to reckon his seniority from this date.
3. TSL has been drawn in contravention of HJS Rules and Direct Recruits of three batches have been wrongly grouped together.
4. He has requested that his seniority be fixed after calculating the vacancies as per S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 10 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

73. **Sri R.H. Zaidi**, placed at Sl. No. 480 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1295-1297 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been promoted to HJS in Feb. 1999.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-1997.
3. He was approved for promotion to UP HJS by the Hon'ble Full Court resolution dated 11-7-98.
4. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case, he is entitled for his promotion on the date of approval i.e. 11-7-98.
5. In view of Rudra Kumar Sain's case his service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored while fixing the seniority.
6. As per law laid down in O.P. Garg's case and S.K. Tripathi's case Direct Recruits appointed after 12-9-1997 cannot be placed above him.
7. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

74. **Sri Shyam Vinod**, placed at Sl. No. 481 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1971-1972 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-1997, he was promoted to HJS on 12-2-1999 but he has been given seniority from 21-5-2005.
2. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from 12-2-1999.
3. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his request for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

75. **Sri Raghvendra Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 482 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 469-471 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12.09.1997, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) in February 1999.
3. In view of S.K. Tripathi's case and Rudra Kumar Sain's case, he should be deemed to have been promoted under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
4. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the date of his approval i.e. 11-07-98.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

76. **Sri Shashank Shekhar**, placed at Sl. No. 486 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 104-106 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12.09.1997, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) in February 1999.
3. In view of S.K. Tripathi's case and Rudra Kumar Sain's case, he should be deemed to have been promoted under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
4. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the date of his approval i.e. 11-07-98.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

77. **Sri Ajay Verma**, placed at Sl. No. 490 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1813-1814 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS in Feb. 1999, he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-97.
2. His seniority has been determined from the date of his notional promotion i.e. 1-6-05.
3. He has requested that he be given seniority w.e.f. 12-9-97 and Direct Recruits who have joined the service in Dec. 1998 be placed below him.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

78. **Sri S.N.A. Zaidi**, placed at Sl. No. 496 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 80-82 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12.09.1997, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) in February 1999.
3. In view of S.K. Tripathi's case and Rudra Kumar Sain's case, he should be deemed to have been promoted under Rule 22(1) on 11.07.1998.
4. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the date of his approval i.e. 11-07-98.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

79. **Sri Riyasat Hussain**, placed at Sl. No. 500 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 83-85 & 1007-1008 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the date of his approval i.e. 11-07-98.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-1997, he was approved for promotion on 11-7-1998.
3. In view of the observation in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to get seniority from the date, he ought to have been promoted in HJS.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim of seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

80. **Sri K.P. Singh-I**, placed at Sl. No. 505 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 648-654 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted substantive vacancy occurred on 12-9-97.
2. He was promoted to UP HJS on 16-2-99 under Rule 22(3).
3. He has been promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) and pursuant thereto he joined on 18-5-05.
4. He is entitled to have his seniority reckoned from 12-9-97.
5. In the alternative, he is entitled to get his seniority settled from 11-7-98, when he was approved for promotion in UP HJS.
6. At last, he has requested that his seniority should at least be counted from 16-2-99, when he started working as Ad-hoc ADJ under Rule 22(3).

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**81. Sri R.K. Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 510 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 466-468 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Vacancy occurred on 12.9.1997 has been allotted to him in the T.S.L.
2. He is entitled to reckon his seniority from 12.9.1997 in the light of law laid down in S.K.Tripathi's case.
3. He has pleaded that his adhoc service in H.J.S. from the year 1999 to 2005 should not be ignored.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim for seniority cannot be accepted. Objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**82. Sri D.K. Tiwari**, placed at Sl. No. 512 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1542-1543 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-97. He was eligible for promotion to HJS on 19-2-93 (completion of three years' as Civil Judge (SD). He was approved for promotion to HJS on 11-7-98. He was promoted as ADJ on 26-6-1999.
2. TSL has been prepared without considering guidelines in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
3. Promotee officers are entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancies to them in their quota.
4. In view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case his appointment under Rule 22 (3) cannot be held to be stop gap or fortuitous or purely ad-hoc.
5. UP Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 have overriding effect over all other rules.
6. He has requested that his seniority be fixed from the date availability of the vacancy.

*Regarding ground No. 5 it has been held earlier that the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The ground mentioned at No. 2 is also without substance. The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his claim of seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**83. Sri Shakti Kant**, placed at Sl. No. 514 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1385-1390 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been drawn in accordance with direction nos. 2 to 4 of S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in UP. JSA's case.
2. Recruitments to UP HJS from the year 1988 have not been made within the time framed prescribed by the Rules, which adversely affected the promotee officers.
3. Promotee officers have not been allotted number of vacancies, they were entitled as per quota rule whereas recruitment from the bar has been made in excess of their quota for Recruitment batch 1988, 1990 and 1992-94.
4. In the TSL he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-1997, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rules 22 (1). Therefore, he should have been promoted in HJS after his approval on 11-7-98.
5. The objector be deemed to have been promoted and appointed against the vacancy available to him and he is entitled to have his seniority counted from that period i.e. date of deemed promotion.
6. Delay in his promotion has resulted inequality injustice in violation of Article 14.
7. Amended Rule 26 is discriminatory, post of district judges should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.
8. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 13 his prayer for seniority cannot be accepted. His objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**84. Sri Prem Singh-II**, placed at Sl. No. 515 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1202-1203 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 23-10-97.
2. He has been placed much below Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto 327) who have joined the service in December 1998.
3. He is entitled to place above these Direct Recruits in view of law down in K.N. Singh's case.
4. In S.N. Dhingara's case the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that by stop gap arrangement the rights of promotee cannot be taken up.
5. He has prayed that the seniority be counted from 23-10-1997 i.e. the date of vacancy became available to him.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3, objections preferred by Shri Singh are without substance and disposed off accordingly.*

**85. Sri V.P. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 518 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 504-599 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 19-12-1997.
2. He was promoted to HJS and joined on 23-6-1999.
3. He was promoted under Rule 22 (1) and joined on 20-5-2005.
4. He was approved for promotion in HJS on 11-7-1998.
5. He is entitled to get his promotion with effect from 19-12-1997, in view of direction of the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case, he is entitled to reckon his seniority from this date.
6. TSL has been wrongly prepared and three batches of Direct Recruits have been wrongly grouped together. These Direct Recruits have been appointed in excess of their quota therefore they are to be pushed down.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 objections of Shri Singh are without substance and disposed off accordingly.*

**86. Sri O.P. Tiwari**, placed at Sl. No. 519 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1568-1571 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS on 25-06-1999.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 19-12-1997.
3. He has been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 13-4-05.
4. He is entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of vacancy to him within quota i.e. 19-12-1997.
5. He is entitled to get his seniority fixed under UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 and other various pronouncements of Hon'ble Apex Court.
6. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*As has been held earlier U.P. Govt. Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**87. Sri V.K. Khatri**, placed at Sl. No. 520 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 925-926 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. has stated that he was promoted as ADJ on 23-06-1999
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 19-12-1997.
3. He was eligible for promotion on 19-12-1997, in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to get seniority above Sri Manoj Kumar Singhal (Sl. No. 289).

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3, objections preferred by Shri Khatri are without substance and disposed of accordingly.*

**88. Sri A.K. Mukherjee**, placed at Sl. No. 523 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 53-54 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 19-12-1997.
2. He was approved for promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 11-07-1998.

3. He was promoted as ADJ on 22-06-1999 under Rule 22 (3).
4. As per S.K. Tripathi and Rudra Kumar Sain's case he should be deemed to be appointed in the cadre on 11-07-1998.
5. He has requested his seniority be fixed w.e.f. from 11-07-1998.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of decision taken by the committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections lack merit and rejected accordingly.*

**89. Sri G.M. Mittal**, placed at Sl. No. 527 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1018-1021 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-1-1998.
2. He has joined as ADJ under Rule 22 (3) on 27-5-2000.
3. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22(1) and he joined as such on 26-5-2005.
4. He is entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of vacancy i.e. 31-1-1998 in view of directions given by Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case
5. The Hon'ble court in UP JSA's case has given certain guidelines to implement the directions given in S.K. Tripathi's case.
6. His service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored for determination of seniority in view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case.
7. He has requested that his seniority be counted from 31-1-98 and he be placed above Sri Manoj Kumar Singhal a Direct Recruit, who has joined the service on 5-12-98.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). The judgment given in UP JSA's case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**90. Sri K.P. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 528 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1447-1451 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-3-1998, he is working in HJS from 25-5-2000 and 19-5-2005.
2. His seniority should be counted from 31-3-98 as held in O.P. Garg's case.
3. He was approved for promotion in 1998 in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to be promoted from 31-3-1998.
4. Direct Recruits who were appointed after 31-3-98 (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto Sl. No. 323) have been wrongly placed above him.
5. Direct Recruits of 1988 batch and of all subsequent batches if found appointed in excess of their quota they are to be down placed.
6. These Direct Recruits are not entitled to be grouped together.
7. He has requested that his seniority be re-fixed accordingly.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5 &10 his request for re-fixation of seniority cannot be accepted, his objections are disposed accordingly.*

**91. Sri L.S. Sahu**, placed at Sl. No. 531 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1742-1743 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-5-98, he was promoted to HJS on 23-5-2000 and appointed as ADJ under Rule 22 (1) and joined as such on 31-5-2005.
2. His service rendered under Rule 22 (3) should be counted and his seniority be fixed w.e.f. from 23-05-2000.
3. Direct Recruits should be allotted vacancies occurring in the relevant Recruitment batch.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2, 4, 5 & 10 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*



92. **Sri B.L. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 538 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1010-1015 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted substantive vacancy occurred on 1-9-98. .
2. He was promoted to UP HJS on 25-5-2000 under Rule 22(3).
3. He has been promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) and pursuant thereto he joined on 27-5-05.
4. He is entitled to get his seniority reckoned from 1-9-98.
5. In the alternative, he is entitled to get his seniority settled from the date when he was approved for promotion to UP HJS.
6. At last, he has requested that his seniority should at least be counted from 25-5-2000, when he started working as Ad-hoc ADJ under Rule 22(3).

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance and disposed off accordingly.*

93. **Sri S.C. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 545 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1724-1729 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Seniority list has not been prepared in accordance with direction given in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in JSA's case.
2. Recruitment for various batches from 1988 have not commenced within the time framed prescribed by the Rule.
3. Recruitment from the bar has been made in excess of their quota in various recruitment from 1988 batch and onward whereas promotion from UP Nyayik Sewa has not been made to fill the vacancy available in the quota of NS.
4. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto 327) have been wrongly placed above the officers of NS.
5. All vacancies existing before 1988 should have been filled up from the promotees.
6. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 3-9-1998.
7. He should have been promoted in December 1998.
8. In view of Rudra Kumar Sain's case his ad-hoc service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored while fixing the seniority.
9. Determination of seniority as per rotational appointment under Rule 22 (2) is against justice and equity and all posts of DJ should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.
10. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed accordingly to law and he should be given an opportunity of personal hearing.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5, 10 & 13 his objections lack merit, hence rejected.*

94. **Sri A.K. Jain**, placed at Sl. No. 548 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 754-756 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (3) and he joined the service on 24-5-2000.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 3-9-1998.
3. He has been promoted under Rule 22 (1) on 25-5-2005
4. Since vacancy was available to him on 3-9-98, he is entitled to get his seniority counted from that date in view of direction no. 3 given by Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case.
5. In K. N. Singh's case it has been held that for determination of seniority of Direct Recruits date of joining will be relevant whereas for determination of seniority of promotee officer date of availability of vacancy in their quota will be important.
6. In view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case his service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored for determination of his seniority.
7. He has requested his seniority be fixed w.e.f. 3-9-98 and he be placed above Sri Manoj Kumar Singhal, DR.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In*

*view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

95. **Sri Ishwar Dayal**, placed at Sl. No. 549 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1245 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS in May 2005 and he joined the service on 29-5-2000.
2. He is regularly working in the same capacity and he again took over charge as ADJ in May,2005
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 3-9-1998 but he was not promoted to HJS at that time without any fault on his part.
4. Therefore, he has prayed that his seniority be fixed 3-9-98 and secondly on 29-5-2000 since when he is regularly in HJS.

*In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 13 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

96. **Sri Pradeep Kumar-I**, placed at Sl. No. 564 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1757-1762 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with direction nos. 2 to 4 of S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in UP. JSA's case.
2. Recruitments to UP HJS from the year 1988 have not been made within the time framed prescribed by the Rules, which affected adversely to promotee officers.
3. Promotee officers have not been allotted number of vacancies, they were entitled as quota rule whereas recruitment from the bar has been made in excess of their quota for Recruitment batch 1988, 1990 and 1992-94.
4. In the TSL he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 5-2-99, he was approved for promotion to HJS under Rules 22 (1). Therefore, he should have been promoted to HJS after his approval in the year 2000.
5. The objector be deemed to have been promoted and appointed against the vacancy available to him and he is entitled to have his seniority counted from that period i.e. date of deemed promotion.
6. Delay in his promotion has resulted inequality and injustice in violation of Article 14.
7. Amended Rule 26 is discriminatory, post of district judges should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.
8. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5, 10 & 13 his objections lack merit, hence rejected.*

97. **Sri P.N. Chaturvedi**, placed at Sl. No. 565 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1992 of the compilation), as under:

He was promoted to HJS on 29-5-2000 and in view of law laid down in S.K. Tripathi's case he be deemed to have been appointed in HJS from that date.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 request made by Shri Chaturvedi is rejected.*

98. **Sri S.P. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 567 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1138 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was allotted vacancy occurred on 28-2-1999. He was promoted as ADJ on 30-5-2000. Since vacancy was available to him when he was promoted to HJS on 30-5-2000 his appointment be deemed to be under Rule 22 (1).
2. Therefore, he has requested that his seniority be counted from 30-5-2000 or in the alternative after giving him benefit of continuous officiation from 30-5-2000, his seniority should be counted from that date.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 request made by Shri Srivastava is rejected.*

**99. Sri S.S. Gupta**, placed at Sl. No. 568 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2008 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 26-3-1999. Therefore, he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 26-3-1999.
2. In the alternative, he has stated that he was promoted to HJS as stop gap arrangement on 29-5-2000 and he continued to work on the post regularly till he was appointed substantively on 6-06-2005.
3. He is entitled to have his seniority fixed at least from 29-05-2000.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 request made by Shri Gupta is rejected*

**100. Sri Anil Kumar Srivastava-II**, placed at Sl. No. 569 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 472-477 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to H.J.S. on adhoc basis in May 2000.
2. He was purportedly appointed as Additional District Judge Under Rule 22(1) in May 2005.
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 26.03.1999.
4. He is entitled to get his seniority fixed from 26.3.1999 and his service from May 2000 to May 2005 may not be ignored.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 request made by Shri Srivastava is rejected.*

**101. Sri B.N. Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 572 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1561-1567 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 26-3-99.
2. He has been promoted to HJS on 26-5-2000. Since delay in promotion is not attributable to him hence he is entitled to get seniority w.e.f. 26-3-99 in view law laid down in K.N. Singh's case and S.N. Dhingra's case.
3. Seniority of the objector should be determined in accordance with provisions of UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991.
4. Validity of provisions contained in Rule 22 (2) and (3) and Rule 26 (1) has been challenged before the Hon'ble Court in various writ petitions and these are pending for adjudication. These provisions cannot be applied for determination of objector seniority.
5. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
6. Allocation of vacancies to Direct Recruits appears to be wrong.
7. He has requested that he be placed at the proper position in view of facts stated above.
8. He was promoted to HJS on 26-5-2000, he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 26-3-1999.

*Constitutionality of seniority rule will be examined on judicial side; the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing rules governing seniority. As has been held earlier U.P. Govt. Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The judgment given in UP JSA's case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 13 his objections are without substance, therefore, rejected.*

**102. Sri Ravindra Bhaskar**, placed at Sl. No. 574 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1206-1210 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-3-1999.
2. He was approved to promotion to UP HJS by Hon'ble Full Court in the year 2000.
3. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he has been denied promotion on the date of his approval.
4. He was promoted to HJS on 25-5-2000 under Rule 22 (3)
5. He was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) in May 2005.

6. In view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case his service under Rule (3) should not be ignored and he be deemed to have been appointed under Rule (1) in HJS from the date of his approval.
7. He has requested that seniority list be amended accordingly.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**103. Sri U.C. Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 585 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1929-1931 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been drawn in contravention of HJS rules.
2. Appointments of 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have been made in excess of their quota.
3. The TSL should have been prepared in accordance with in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. He has requested that TSL be quashed and fresh seniority list be prepared.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 objections of Shri Srivastava are without substance, hence rejected accordingly.*

**104. Sri P.C. Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 595 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1755-1756 of the compilation) as under:

Seniority of Direct Recruits must be determined according to dates of their appointments and seniority of promotees should be counted from the date of their continuous officiation. He has reserved his right to file objection after he receives detailed informations in respect of criteria for fixing the seniority.

*The criteria for fixing seniority have been given in O.P. Garg's case. The objections preferred by the objector need not detain the Committee, therefore, they are disposed of accordingly.*

**105. Sri Janardan Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 594 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1668-1671 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) in June 2002 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 13-4-05.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 5-5-1999.
3. His seniority is to be determined as per Rule 26. If seniority is to be determined as per Rule 22 (2) and Rule 26 the Direct Recruits will get seniority from the date prior to their joining the service which will be unjust and improper.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 objections preferred by Shri Singh are without substance, hence rejected.*

**106. Sri Md. Babar**, placed at Sl. No. 598 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 921-923 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has requested that he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. the year of approval 2000.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 5-5-1999.
3. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22(3) on 24-03-01 in view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case his service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored for determination of seniority.
4. He was promoted to UP HJS under 22 (1) in May 2005 even though he was already working on such post.
5. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to reckon his seniority from the year 2000 i.e. the year of his approval.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections lack merit, hence rejected.*

**107. Sri Vijay Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 600 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1023-1024 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 5-5-1999.
2. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 29-3-2001.
3. He was promoted to UP HJS on 17-5-05 and joined the service on 21-5-2005
4. In view of law laid down in O.P. Garg's case and S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to be promoted to HJS on 5-5-1999.
5. Either his seniority should be counted from 5-5-1999 i.e. date of vacancy or at the worst from 29-3-2001 since he is working in HJS cadre without any break.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected*

**108. Sri Arun Prakash**, placed at Sl. No. 601 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1453-1456 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) in March 2001 and took over charge on 24-3-2001.
2. His aforesaid promotion was made after following the due procedure and approval under Rule 20.
3. He was again appointed as ADJ under 22 (1) in May 2005, he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 5-5-1999.
4. His seniority is to be fixed in view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case and observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rudra Kumar Sain's case.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections lack merit, hence rejected.*

**109. Sri Shiv Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 605 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1462-1468 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared following the principle of quota and rota as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in R.K. Sabharwal's case.
2. TSL has not been prepared keeping in view the length of service of HJS officers as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rudra Kumar Sain's case.
3. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with the direction in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. TSL has not been prepared keeping in view the principles indicated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in UP JSA's case. Therefore, the TSL has been prepared in violation of principle of equality as provided under Article 14.
5. Request has been made that TSL be quashed and a fresh seniority list be prepared as stated above.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). The judgment given in UP JSA's case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Seniority list has been prepared in accordance with existing rules and directions made in S.K. Tripathi's case*

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 objections of Shri Sharma are without substance, hence rejected.*

**110. Sri Shyam Sundar**, placed at Sl. No. 607 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1976-1978 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-5-1999, he was promoted to HJS on 26-3-2001 but he has been given seniority from 19-5-2005.
2. He has requested that he be given seniority from 26-3-2001..

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**111. Sri R.K. Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 608 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1993 of the compilation) as under:

He was promoted to HJS on 27-3-2001 and in view of law laid down in S.K. Tripathi's case he be deemed to have been appointed in HJS from that date.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**112. Sri C.L. Verma**, placed at Sl. No. 609 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1544-1550 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-7-99.
2. He has been promoted to HJS on 24-3-2001. Since delay in promotion is not attributable to him hence he is entitled to get seniority w.e.f. 31-7-99 in view law laid down in K.N. Singh's case and S.N. Dhingra's case.
3. Seniority of the objector should be determined in accordance with provisions of UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991.
4. Validity of provisions contained in Rule 22 (2) and (3) and Rule 26 (1) has been challenged before the Hon'ble Court in various writ petitions and these are pending for adjudication. These provisions cannot be applied for determination of objector seniority.
5. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
6. Allocation of vacancies to Direct Recruits appears to be wrong.
7. He has requested that he be placed at the proper position in view of facts stated above.

*Constitutionality of seniority rule will be examined on judicial side; the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing rules governing seniority. As has been held earlier U.P. Govt. Servant Seniority Rules 1991 will have no application here. The judgment given in UP JSA's case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. In view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 & 13 his objections are without substance therefore rejected.*

**113. Sri S.B. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 612 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 670 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that dispute regarding seniority is continuing between Direct Recruits and promoted officers since inception of UP HJS Rules. In spite of long litigation in Hon'ble Court and Hon'ble Apex Court the dispute has not been settled finally.
2. He is of opinion that seniority list of Direct Recruits and promoted officers be prepared separately and they should be posted as DJ, in the tribunal, on deputation and in the Hon'ble Court commensurate with percentage of their quota.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**114. Sri R.C. Chaudhary**, placed at Sl. No. 615 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1732 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-8-99, he was promoted to HJS on 24-3-2001, his services were regularized w.e.f. 2-6-05.
2. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from 31-8-1999.
3. He has requested that seniority be counted accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**115. Sri R.S. Sachan**, placed at Sl. No. 616 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1738-1739 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-9-1999, he was promoted to HJS on 24-3-01 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) and joined as such on 27-5-05.
2. His services as ADJ for more than four years have been ignored while determining his seniority.
3. Therefore, he has requested that his seniority be fixed w.e.f. 24-3-01.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**116. Sri M.P. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 618 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2031-2032 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 11-10-99, he was promoted under Rule 22 (3) on 27-3-01, he has joined as ADJ under Rule 22 (1) on 30-5-05.
2. His seniority has been fixed from May 2005 whereas he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 11-10-99.
3. He has requested that seniority be corrected accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**117. Sri Ram Chandra-II**, placed at Sl. No. 627 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1863-1865 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 3-2-2000, he was approved for promotion in the year 2000 and he was eligible for promotion in Feb. 1993.
2. He was promoted to HJS on 22-5-01 under Rule 22 (3), he was appointed in HJS under Rules 22 (1) in May 2005. His services from May 2001 to May 2005 may not be ignored in view of law down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case.
3. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he should be deemed to have been appointed under Rule 22 (1) from the date of his approval in the year 2000.
4. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**118. Sri S.K. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 644 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1580-1590 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. The seniority of promotee officers is to be determined from the date of continuous officiation.
2. No distinction can be made between Direct Recruits or promotee officer appointed to a temporary post in the service.
3. They both are appointed on regular basis on cadre post.
4. In order to minimize the inequities it is necessary to avoid classification between promotees appointed under Rule 22 (1) and under Rule 22 (3).
5. To obviate disparity best solution is to apply the rule which has been approved in S.B. Patwardhan's case.
6. Quota and rota rule may be made applicable upto the limit of 15% for the post of ADJ or DJ and for elevation to the bench.
7. For calculation of vacancies post of deputation and leave reserve should not be taken into consideration.
8. Decision of S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case should be made effective.

*The judgment given in UP JSA's case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. The directions in S.K.Tripathi's case have been complied with. As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2-5 & 10 the objections raised by Shri Singh are without substance, rejected accordingly.*

**119. Sri P.K. Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 645 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1994 of the compilation) as under:

He has requested that his seniority be fixed from the date of availability of vacancy in H.J.S. in view of law down in O.P. Garg's case.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**120. Sri Mumtaz Ali**, placed at Sl. No. 647 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1664-1665 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) in May 2001 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) in May 2005.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 4-7-2000 but his seniority has been fixed from 20-5-05.
3. According to various pronouncements of Supreme court he is entitled to have his seniority counted from the date of continuous officiation. It has also been held that promotee officer is entitled for seniority from the date of availability of vacancy to him within his quota.
4. He has requested that his submission may be placed before the Seniority Committee.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**121. Sri Virendra Kumar**, placed at Sl. No. 650 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1939-1946 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared according to HJS Rules, direction in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in UP JSA's case.
2. According to him only 4 vacancies were available in the quota of Direct Recruits for Recruitment batch 2000. Thus 16 Direct Recruits have been appointed in June 2005 in excess of their quota.
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-7-2000, he was promoted to HJS on 15-5-2001.
4. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from 31-7-2000.
5. He has requested that TSL be corrected accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 the objections of Shri Kumar are without substance, hence rejected.*

**122. Sri U.C. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 652 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1993 of the compilation) as under:

He has requested that TSL should have been prepared keeping in view the pronouncement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in S.K. Tripathi's case, O.P. Garg's case, All India Judges' Association' case, R.K. Sabharwal's case. He has also requested that TSL should be drawn keeping in view the direction of Hon'ble Court given in WP No. 316 of 2004 UP Judicial Service Association Vs. State UP

*Submission made by Shri Pandey is vague, his seniority has been fixed in accordance with existing rules and law laid down by Hon'ble Apex court as also this court. His claim for seniority is without substance, hence rejected.*

**123. Sri S.K. Agarwal**, placed at Sl. No. 653 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1301-1317 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-7-2000 and he has been promoted to HJS on 19-5-05 under Rule 22 (1).
2. In view of law laid down in O.P. Garg's case he is entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of vacancy within the quota for him i.e. 31-7-2000.
3. He has further stated that he was approved for promotion on 9-4-2000 and he was promoted under Rule 22 (3) on 9-5-2001 against FTC.
4. In view of law laid down in Brij Mohan Lal's case he is entitled to get the period of continuous officiation from 18-5-01 since he is working as ADJ.
5. He has requested that seniority be re-fixed and his officiation period be counted from 31-7-2000 for fixation of seniority

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**124. Sri Raj Kumar-II**, placed at Sl. No. 655 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1740-1741 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 21/22-08-2000, he was promoted to HJS on 18-5-01 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) and joined as such on 21-5-05.
2. His seniority has been counted from 21-5-05 whereas he is entitled to have his seniority fixed from 18-5-01.



3. Direct Recruits have been allotted vacancies prior to their date of appointments. In case Direct Recruitment to HJS has not been made, vacancies of their quota have been carried forward and added with the vacancies of next recruitment.
4. He has requested that appointment of Direct Recruits be made against the vacancies occurred in that Recruitment year.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2, 4 & 5 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**125. Sri B.M. Sinha**, placed at Sl. No. 657 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 269-270 of the compilation) are as under:

He has stated that he was promoted in UP HJS on 16-5-01 under Rule 22 (3) and he was appointed under Rule 22 (1) on 20-5-05. He is entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of substantive vacancy. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-8-2000. He is entitled to reckon his seniority from that date.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**126. Sri Gokulesh**, placed at Sl. No. 661 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1577-1579 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. While preparing TSL directions in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines given in UP JSA's case have not been considered.
2. Amended Rule 22 (3) and 26 should be ignored being violative of Article 14 and 16 and Rule 8 of UP Government Servant Seniority Rules 1991.
3. His seniority is to be counted from the date of vacancy was available to him within quota or at least from the date of continuous officiation in HJS.
4. He has requested that seniority list be prepared keeping in view the settled legal position.

*So far as ground No. 2 is concerned constitutionality of the Rules will be examined on judicial side, the Committee has to proceed in accordance with existing Rules governing seniority. It has been held earlier that the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991 will have no application here. The ground mentioned at No. 1 is also without substance. The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**127. Sri N.K. Garg**, placed at Sl. No. 669 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2033 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, he is entitled to have his seniority fixed from 29-3-01.
2. In the alternative, he has requested that his seniority be fixed from 18-5-01 when he joined in UP HJS.
3. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**128. Smt. Sushila Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 673 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 1686-1691 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with direction nos. 2 to 4 of S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in UP. JSA's case.
2. Recruitments to UP HJS from the year 1988 have not been made within the time frame prescribed by the Rules, which adversely affected the promotee officers.

3. Promotee officers have not been allotted number of vacancies they were entitled as per quota rule whereas recruitment from Bar has been made in excess of their quota for Recruitment batch 1988, 1990 and 1992-94.
4. In the TSL she has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-2001, she was approved for promotion to HJS 9.4.2000. Therefore, she should have been promoted to HJS after her approval.
5. The objector be deemed to have been promoted and appointed against the vacancy available to her and she is entitled to have her seniority counted from that period i.e. date of deemed promotion.
6. Delay in her promotion has resulted inequality and injustice in violation of Article 14.
7. Amended Rule 26 is discriminatory, post of district judges should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.
8. She has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,4,5,10 & 13 her claim for seniority cannot be accepted. Her objections are accordingly disposed of.*

**129. Sri A.C. Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 681 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1326-1361 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, he has been promoted in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 19-5-05. In view of O.P. Garg's case and S.K. Tripathi's case relevant date for determining his seniority is 29-3-2001.
2. He was approved for promotion in UP HJS on 9-4-2000, inspite of availability of substantive vacancy within quota for him he was not given promotion in UP HJS and made to work as ADJ (FTC) under Rule 22 (3).
3. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case and observation made in para 14 of B.M. Lal's case, he is entitled to have his period of continuous officiation counted from 29-03-01.
4. He has requested that his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**130. Sri R.K. Gautam**, placed at Sl. No. 683 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1611-1614 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been drawn in accordance with provisions contained in UP HJS Rules 1975, UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 and law down by the Hon'ble Apex Court.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, he was approved for promotion in HJS on 9-4-2000 and he was promoted to HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 9-5-2001 and posted as ADJ (FTC).
3. As per direction in S.K. Tripathi's case and in R.K. Yadav's case he is entitled to be promoted w.e.f. from the date he should have been promoted.
4. Vacancies have not been calculated in accordance with S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
5. He has requested that his seniority be counted from 16-5-01.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**131. Sri Ramesh Tiwari**, placed at Sl. No. 686 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1292-1293 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has not been prepared in accordance with the judgement passed in S.K. Tripathi's case and UP JSA's case.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred 29-3-2001, he was promoted to UP HJS in May 2001.
3. Hence he is entitled for his seniority since 19-5-2001 (the date he joined UP HJS).

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**132. Sri R.L. Mehrotra**, placed at Sl. No. 690 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1986-1987 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, he was promoted to HJS on May 2001 but he has been given seniority from 19-5-05.
2. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from May 2001.
3. He has requested that his seniority be corrected accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**133. Sri Mahboob Ali**, placed at Sl. No. 691 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1557-1560 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to HJS on 15-05-01 and appointed as ADJ (FTC).
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01.
3. He has been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 13-4-05.
4. He is entitled to get seniority from the date of availability of vacancy to him within quota i.e. 29-3-01.
5. He is entitled to get his seniority fixed under UP Government Servant Seniority Rules, 1991 and other various pronouncements of Hon'ble Apex Court.
6. He has requested that the seniority be fixed from the year 1999 or 2000 or at least from 29-3-01.

*Sri Ali has also sought support for his claim for seniority with the help of U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules 1991. This ground lacks merit as these rules have been framed by the State Government under Article 309 of the Constitution. These rules have not been made in consultation with the High Court. In view of provisions contained in Article 233 these Rules cannot have any application with regard to determination of seniority of Judicial Officers.*

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**134. Sri R.N. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 692 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1778-1783 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Seniority list has not been prepared in accordance with direction given in S.K. Tripathi's case and guidelines laid down in JSA's case.
2. Recruitments for various batches from 1988 have not commenced within the time frame prescribed by the Rule.
3. Recruitment from Bar has been made in excess of their quota in various recruitments from 1988 batch and onward whereas promotion from UP Nyayik Sewa has not been made to fill the vacancy available in the quota of NS.
4. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 289, 291 and so on upto 327) have been wrongly placed above the officer of NS.
5. All vacancies existing before 1988 should have been filled up from the promotees.
6. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29.3.2001.
7. He should have deemed to have been promoted on 15.5.2001 instead of 13.4.2005
8. In view of Rudra Kumar Sain's case his ad-hoc service under Rule 22 (3) may not be ignored while fixing the seniority.
9. Determination of seniority as per rotational appointment under Rule 22 (2) is against justice and equity and all posts of DJ should be allocated proportionately to both the sources.

10. He has prayed that his seniority be fixed accordingly to law and he should be given an opportunity of personal hearing.

*The judgment given in U.P.J.S.A.'s case is under challenge before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with.*

*Rudra Kumar Sain's case has no application here in view of provisions contained in proviso to Rule 22 (3). In view of decision taken by the committee on Issue Nos. 2-5, 10 & 13 his objections lack merit, hence rejected.*

- 135. Sri S.M. Haseeb**, placed at Sl. No. 696 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1551-1553 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was approved for his promotion to HJS in the year 2001 and he was promoted to HJS on 23-3-2001 against Fast Track Courts.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, though he has been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 13-4-2005.
3. He is entitled to get seniority from 29-3-01 i.e. the date of availability of vacancy to him within quota.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

- 136. Sri D.K. Singh-I**, placed at Sl. No. 697 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 39-42 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was allotted vacancy occurred on 29.03.2001, he was promoted under Rule 22(3) on 16.05.2001 and posted as A.D.J., F.T.C.
2. He has been given seniority from 19.05.2005, in view of law laid down in B.M.Lal's case and S.K.Tripathi's case, he is entitled to get seniority from 16.05.2001 on the basis of his continuous officiation.
3. He has requested that date of availability of substantive vacancy i.e. 29-03-01 for his promotion in HJS be treated as date relevant for fixation of seniority or at least the date of continuous officiation i.e. 16.05.2001.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

- 137. Sri Shamshad Ahmad**, placed at Sl. No. 698 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1027-1028 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to UP HJS on 15-5-01 under Rule 22 (3).
2. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) and joined as such 26-5-05.
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01.
4. In the TSL his seniority has been counted from 26-5-05, in gross violation of various decisions of Hon'ble Apex Court and Hon'ble Court.
5. In view of law laid down in O.P. Garg's case and K.N. Singh's case, his seniority is to be determined on the basis of date of availability of vacancy within quota to him.
6. In All India Judges's Association' case, P.S. Mahals' case and Sonal's case it has been held that seniority shall be counted from the date of officiation.
7. Direct Recruits cannot get seniority prior to their actual joining in the service.
8. He has requested that his seniority be reckoned from 29-3-01.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 & 3 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

- 138. Sri Ramesh Chandra-II**, placed at Sl. No. 703 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1362-1363 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy arose on 29-3-2001.
2. He has been promoted to HJS on 30-10-01 and took charge as ADJ (FTC) on 1-11-01.
3. In view of direction no. 3 in S.K. Tripathi's case he is entitled to get seniority from 29-3-01.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**139. Sri D.K. Mishra**, placed at Sl. No. 705 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1554-1556 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was approved for his promotion to HJS in the year 2001 and he was promoted to HJS on 23-3-2001 against Fast Track Courts.
2. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 29-3-01, though he has been appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 13-4-2005.
3. He should have deemed to have been promoted on 15.5.2001 instead of 13.4.2005
4. He is entitled to get seniority from 29-3-01 i.e. the date of availability of vacancy to him within quota.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**140. Sri V.K. Sharma**, placed at Sl. No. 711 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1947-1949 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. TSL has been prepared in contravention of HJS Rules.
2. Appointments of 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have been made in excess of their quota.
3. The TSL should have been prepared in accordance with in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. He has requested that TSL be quashed and fresh seniority list be prepared.

*Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with. In view of the decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2 to 5 objections of Shri Sharma are without substance, rejected.*

**141. Sri Pradeep Chaudhary**, placed at Sl. No. 715 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 1973-1974 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-6-01, he was promoted to HJS on 31-10-01 but he has been given seniority from 19-5-05
2. He is entitled to have his seniority counted from 31-10-2001.
3. He has requested that his seniority be corrected accordingly.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**142. Sri B.D. Misra**, placed at Sl. No. 723 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2009 of the compilation) as under:

He has requested that his seniority in HJS be fixed on the basis of judgement in S.K. Tripathi's case and K.N. Singh's case.

*Directions in S.K. Tripathi's case have been complied with. As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

**143.** One representation dated 1.8.2006 on behalf of U.P. Judicial Services Association has also been received, grounds in this representation with principal issues raised therein are as under:-

1. Earlier seniority list having attained finality, Sri U.C. Tiwari and 4 others appointed in 1985 to get seniority from the date of joining. There was no stay order against these appointees.
2. The seniority of the appointees of 1984 Recruitment is to be determined in accordance with directions in O.P. Garg's case. These appointees are not entitled for seniority from any notional date prior to the date of their actual joining. No stay order was against first six appointees. In respect of last four appointees whose appointment remained stayed the Apex Court directed that their seniority shall be determined in accordance with directions in O.P. Garg's case.
3. 24 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch are not entitled to get seniority from the date of stay order as appointment from both the streams (Direct Recruitment as well promotion) remained stayed.

4. Direct Recruits are not entitled to vacancies more than 15% of the permanent cadre strength. Hence only 9 Direct Recruits could be appointed in 1988 batch. Temporary posts occupied by promoted officers cannot be counted as vacant.

*As per decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 2,3,4,5 & 8 these objections are without substance, hence rejected.*

### **C. Objections preferred by Retired H.J.S. Officers of the Judicial Officers' Service**

1. **Sri Y.S. Raizada**, placed at Sl. No. J.O. 17 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 109-256 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that he retired on 31.5. 94 while working as Judge, Family Court, Bareilly but his date of retirement has been incorrectly shown as 31-05-1992 to deprive him of supertime scale as approved by the Apex Court in All India Judges' case.
2. In the TSL his placement has been wrongly shown. He has prayed that seniority list be rectified.
3. The Hon'ble Court be moved to grant him super time scale of Rs. 22850-24850.

*As per record his date of birth is 18.5.1934. Till his retirement the age of superannuation of H.J.S. Officers was 58 years. The Uttar Pradesh Judicial Officers (Retirement on Superannuation) Rules, 1992, have been enacted and promulgated on October 20, 1992. By these Rules age of Superannuation of Judicial Officer has been raised from 58 years to 60 years. Thus the request made by him with regard to correction of his age of retirement is without substance, however in the column of date of retirement of Sri Raizada date 30.5.1992 has been mentioned or entered inadvertently in place of 31.5.1992. This mistake be rectified by the office.*

*Seniority list mentioned in para 2 of objections has been disapproved by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of P.K. Dixit Vs. State of U.P. AIR 1988 Supreme Court 260 and fresh seniority list was prepared by the earlier Seniority Committee as per O.P. Garg's case. His placement in the list prepared in 1988 has no significance. In view of the above objections raised by him are without substance and his request is rejected accordingly.*

2. **Sri B.G. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. J.O. 22 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 965-975 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that his date of seniority has already been fixed as 16-5-1984.
2. In the TSL he has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31-12-1986.
3. His already fixed seniority cannot be changed and he cannot be down placed.
4. He has prayed that he be given seniority from the date of his appointment in HJS i.e. 7-7-1982.

*In view of P.K. Dixit & O.P. Garg's case draft seniority list of 1988 has no significance. In view of decision taken by the Committee of Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, therefore, his request is rejected.*

3. **Sri S.M. Goel**, placed at Sl. No. J.O. 32 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 324—325, 929-930 of the compilation) as under:

He has stated that he was promoted in HJS vide Court's notification dated 29-06-1982. Sri B.G. Saxena (Sl. No. 22) is just senior to him and he should have been placed in the seniority list next to Sri Saxena. Earlier, he was allocated vacancy occurred on 1984. Now he has been allocated

vacancy occurred on 27-6-1987. He has been allowed selection grade since 1-11-1988. He may be given super time scale of the HJS.

*In view of P.K. Dixit & O.P. Garg's case draft seniority list of 1988 has no significance. In view of decision taken by the Committee of Issue No. 2 his objections are without substance, therefore, his request is rejected.*

4. **Sri R.L. Soni**, placed at Sl. No. J.O. 34 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 326-327 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has stated that his name has been wrongly spelt as RAJANPURA LAL SONI in place of RAJENDRA LAL SONI. In the present list, his placement has been lowered down to Sl. No. 34 below Sri P.N. Mehrotra whereas in the earlier list his placement was just below Sri B.G. Saxena
2. He was given selection grade w.e.f. 30.6.1987. He has not been given super time scale.
3. Therefore, he has requested that his name, placement be corrected in the TSL and after awarding super time scale his pension be revised.

*His request for correction of his name has been allowed vide decision taken on 18.9.2006.*

*As per record available in Services Section his placement in seniority list should have been above Sri S.M. Goel (J.O. 32) and below Sri B.G. Saxena (J.O. 22). To this extent his request is accepted and he be placed below Sri B.G. Saxena (J.O. 22). His other requests are without substance, therefore, rejected.*

#### **D. Representations of the Officers, who could not find place in TSL for want of vacancy:**

1. **Sri T. Prasad**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 260-261 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has stated that he was appointed in UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) vide Govt. order dated 13-4-05 and joined the said post on 21-5-05 but his name does not find place in TSL
2. He has further stated that after his joining 19 Direct Recruits were posted and their names have been placed at Sl. Nos. 726 to 745.
3. He has requested that his name be placed in the seniority list above 19 Direct Recruits (at Sl. No. 726 to 745).

He was approved by Full Court on 5-02-2005 for his appointment in HJS. He was appointed under Rule 22 (1) by the State Govt. vide notification dated 13-04-2005. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.7.2001. His name has been included in the seniority list. His objections are disposed off accordingly.

2. **Sri Shyam Raj**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 321-323 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has stated that he was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (3) vide Court's Notification dated 30-10-2001. he was promoted under Rule 22 (1) vide Court's Notification dated 17-5-2005. His name does find place in the TSL, though 19 Direct Recruits who have joined the service after him has been shown at Sl. Nos. 727 to 745. After the name of Sri Liyaqat Ali-II at Sl. No. 726 his name along with other promotee officers appointed with him should have been shown.
2. Therefore, he has prayed that his name be included in the seniority list at the proper place.

*He was approved by Full Court on 5-02-2005 for his appointment in HJS. He was appointed under Rule 22 (1) by the State Govt. vide notification dated 13-04-2005. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-06-2001. His name has been included in the seniority list. His objections are disposed off accordingly.*

3. **Sri B.D. Naqvi**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 751-753 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He has been promoted to U.P.H.J.S. w.e.f. 1.3.05 and he joined.
  2. He should have been placed after Sri Liyaqat Ali (Sl. No. 726) but his name does not find place in the TSL
  3. Direct Recruits who joined the service after him have been given seniority in the TSL.
  4. He was promoted to U.P.H.J.S. in the year 2002 and posted in FTC, he took over charge in the FTC on 31.1.2002.
  5. He has been deprived of his seniority thus his fundamental right has been infringed. He has referred the case of Maharashtra State Judicial Service Association Vs. High Court of Judicature at Bombay.
  6. He has prayed that he may be placed in the seniority list at the proper place

*Though he has been substantively appointed under Rule 22 (1) of HJS Rules vide Govt. order dated 13-04-2005, his name could not be placed in TSL as no vacancy within quota was available for him. In view of the above, his request cannot be granted, therefore, rejected.*

4. **Sri A.K. Ojha**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1042-1044 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He has stated that his name has not included in the TSL.
  2. He was promoted to UP HJS on 24-10-01 and he had joined the service on 31-10-01 on stop-gap-arrangement
  3. In Rudra Kumar Sain's case, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that if a person has essential qualifications for his appointment on a particular post his appointment has been made by Competent Authority and he has worked on that post for a long time, his services cannot be treated as ad-hoc.
  4. As he is working in HJS from 31-10-01 his name should be included in the TSL
  5. TSL has been drawn without following the direction given in S.K. Tripathi's case and All India Judges' Association's case.
  6. He has requested that he be given placement in the seniority list.

*He has not been approved for his appointment in HJS by the Full Court nor he has been appointed as such. He is working as ad-hoc Additional District Judge. His request for placement in the seniority list cannot be granted, hence rejected.*

5. **Sri Arun K. Tripathi**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1075-1079 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (3) and appointed to work as ADJ in Fast Track Court.
  2. He was approved for his promotion to HJS by Hon'ble Full Court on 5-2-05 and his name was placed at Sl. No. 314.
  3. He was appointed in UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) and he took charge on 19-5-05
  4. Name of the objecting requestor does not find place in the TSL due to want of vacancy.
  5. The exercise of working out vacancies available to respective sources appears to be in violation of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case.
  6. The amended Rule 26 cannot be legally applied without making a consequential change in Rule 22 (2) and rotation of vacancies should have been provided commensurate with the quota available to various sources i.e. 85:15.
  7. In P.S. Mahals case the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that roster should in conformity with the quota rule.
  8. On 31-12-92, 46 Direct Recruits were working, on that date cadre strength of HJS was 596, at the rate of 15% on that date only 89.04 DR could have been appointed in view of proviso to Rule 8 (2). Against the vacancies occurred upto 31-12-1992, 47 vacancies were allocated to Direct Recruits. Thus on 31-12-92 permissible limit for Direct Recruits was contravened because 93 vacancies came to be allocated to Direct Recruits as against maximum entitlement of 89 vacancies.
  9. Therefore, he has prayed that seniority list be corrected accordingly

*He was approved by Full Court on 5-02-2005 for his appointment in HJS. He was appointed under Rule 22 (1) by*



*the State Govt. vide notification dated 13-04-2005. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-06-2001. His name has been included in the TSL. His objections are disposed off accordingly.*

6. **Sri Rajeev Goel**, as preferred his objections (page nos. 1131-1137 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He was appointed in UP HJS as stop gap arrangement vide Govt. Notification dated 24-10-01.
  2. He joined the service on 31-10-01.
  3. He is working as ADJ for four years and 10 months continuously. In view of law laid down in Rudra Kumar Sain's case, his appointment cannot be treated as stop gap Arrangement.
  4. While preparing the TSL directions made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.K. Tripathi's case were not complied with.
  5. He is entitled to be treated as permanent member of HJS, therefore, his name should be included in the seniority list.

*He has not been approved for his appointment in HJS by the Full Court nor he has been appointed as such. He is working as ad-hoc Additional District Judge. His request for placement in the seniority list cannot be granted, hence his objections are rejected.*

7. **Sri T.S. Rana**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1318-1325 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He was promoted to HJS on 31-10-2001 and joined as ADJ (FTC) on 6-11-01.
  2. He was shifted to regular side on 28-2-05 and pursuant thereto he joined on 3-3-05.
  3. He was confirmed in HJS on 18-5-2005.
  4. 19 Direct Recruits were appointed in HJS between 10-6-05 to 16-11-05, who have been placed at Sl. Nos. 727 to 745 in the TSL.
  5. The objector is entitled to his seniority w.e.f. 31-10-01 or at least 6-11-01 i.e. date of joining.
  6. His service rendered as ADJ (FTC) have not been counted for determination of his seniority, in view of Hon'ble Court's direction in B.M. Lal Vs. Union of India AIR 2002 SC 2096 (para no. 14), he is entitled to have this period counted for determination of his seniority.
  7. He has requested that his name be placed after Sri Liyaqat Ali-II (Sl. No. 726) and above Sri V.P. Kandpal (Sl. No. 727).

*He was approved by Full Court on 5-02-2005 for his appointment in HJS. He was appointed under Rule 22 (1) by the State Govt. vide notification dated 13-04-2005. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 30-06-2001. His name has been included in the TSL, his objections are disposed of accordingly.*

8. **Sri R.R. Saroj**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1683-1685 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He has been promoted to HJS on 30-10-01 and he was appointed in HJS under Rule 22 (1) and joined as such on 21-5-05.
  2. After Sri Liyaqat Ali-II (Sl. No. 726) names of 19 Direct Recruits who have joined the service after objectors have been shown.
  3. Name of the objector does not find place in the seniority list with the result that the objector has been made junior to aforesaid 19 Direct Recruits.
  4. He has requested that his name be included in the seniority list.

He was approved by Full Court on 5-02-2005 for his appointment in HJS. He was appointed under Rule 22 (1) by the State Govt. vide notification dated 13-04-2005. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.7.2001. His name has been included in the seniority list. His objections are disposed off accordingly.

9. **Sri Pradeep Kumar Consul**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1713-1723 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -
1. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (3) on 30-10-01 against FTC, he was shifted to regular side on 28-02-05 but his name does not find place in the TSL.

2. As per law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Rudra Kumar Sain's case he is entitled to be considered as permanent member of HJS w.e.f. 31-10-01.
3. Calculation of vacancies is to be made as per direction in S.K. Tripathi's case, if so calculated some more vacancies will be available to the promoted officers. Therefore, he is entitled to be included in the seniority list.
4. He has requested that his name be included in the seniority list at the appropriate place.

*He has not been approved for his appointment in HJS by the Full Court nor he has been appointed as such. He is working as ad-hoc Additional District Judge. His request for placement in the seniority list cannot be granted, hence rejected.*

10. **Sri R.B. Sharma**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1789-1790 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. His name does not find place in the TSL.
2. He has been promoted to HJS in Oct. 2001 and his services were regularized in March 2005.
3. Direct Recruits (Sl. Nos. 727 to 745) have been placed in the TSL, though they have joined the service in June 2005 or after that.
4. He has requested that his name be included in the seniority list after Sl. No. 726 and before Sl. No. 727.

*Though he has been substantively appointed under Rule 22 (1) of HJS Rules vide Govt. order dated 13-04-2005, his name could not be placed in the TSL as no vacancy within quota was available for him. In view of above, his request cannot be granted, therefore, rejected.*

11. **Sri Ajai Tyagi**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 2040-2041 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. TSL has been drawn in contravention of HJS Rules.
2. Appointments of 17 Direct Recruits of 1988 batch have been made in excess of their quota.
3. The TSL should have been prepared in accordance with in S.K. Tripathi's case.
4. He has requested that the TSL be quashed and fresh seniority list be prepared.

*He has not been approved for his appointment in HJS by the Full Court nor he has been appointed as such. He is working as ad-hoc Additional District Judge. His request for placement in the seniority list cannot be granted, his other ground is also without merit in view of decision taken by the Committee on Issue Nos. 4 & 5 hence rejected.*

#### **E. Representations of the Officers, who have been superseded:**

1. **Sri Jagannath**, has preferred his objection (page nos. 107-108 of the compilation) as under:

He has stated that he should be treated to have been confirmed in UP HJS, therefore he became permanent HJS from 26-5-00. Thus, he has prayed that in view of his continuous officiation in HJS from 26-5-00. His name be placed in the seniority list accordingly.

*He has not been approved for his promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1), his prayer for placement is rejected.*

2. **Sri A.K. Nigam**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 642-644 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (3) and he joined as ADJ on 27-3-01.
2. His name was not considered for his promotion in UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) due to complaint against him and officers junior to him Sri Vinod Kumar Srivastava-III was promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) in 2005

3. On 11-4-05 he was placed under suspension and departmental enquiry has been initiated against him.
4. No vacancy has been reserved for him in HJS, he may suffer irreparable loss due to non-reservation of vacancy for him.
5. Therefore, he has prayed that a vacancy in substantive post of HJS may be reserved for him.

*He has not been approved for his promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1), his prayer for keeping reserve a vacancy for him is rejected.*

3. **Sri A.K. Awasthi**, has preferred his objections (page no. 928 - of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

- 1- He has stated that his name has been omitted from TSL.
- 2- He has requested that his name be placed on Sl. No. 493 in the TSL.

*He has not been approved for his promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1), his prayer for placement is rejected.*

4. **Sri R.K. Upadhyay**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 1368-1373 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. His name does not find place in the TSL.
2. On 30-9-04 he was placed under suspension and inquiry was initiated against him.
3. During the pendency of suspension/enquiry, promotee officers working under Rule 22 (3) have been promoted to UP HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 17-5-05 but his promotion under Rule 22 (1) was deferred.
4. He has been exonerated from the charges and reinstated. He deserves to be placed in the TSL at Sl. No. 647 against the vacancy occurred due to compulsory retirement of Sri F.A. Khan on 4-7-2000.
5. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*He has not been approved for his promotion to HJS under Rule 22 (1), his prayer for placement is rejected.*

#### **F. No Objection Matters:**

1. **Sri A.K. Roopanwal**, placed at Sl. No. 1 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 17 of the compilation) as under: -

*Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer.*

2. **Sri B.N. Shukla**, placed at Sl. No. 32 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 31 of the compilation) as under: -

*Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer.*

3. **Sri R.M. Chauhan**, placed at Sl. No. 33 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page nos. 463-464 of the compilation) as under: -

1. He has stated that he was promoted in H.J.S. to August 986. He supports the correctness of the T.S.L. as final Seniority List.
2. Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer.

4. **Sri A.K. Mathur**, placed at Sl. No. 199 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page nos. 52 of the compilation) as under: -

*Opportunity for filing objection may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*

5. **Sri A.K. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 06 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 55 of the compilation) as under: -

*Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer.*

6. **Sri B.P. Shukla**, placed at Sl. No. 248 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 328 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer.*
7. **Sri V.K. Dixit**, placed at Sl. No. 249 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 465 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
8. **Sri Ashok Srivastava**, placed at Sl. No. 227 in the TSL has preferred his no objections (page nos. 479-482 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity of hearing is solicited if his placement is proposed to be changed in view of objection by any officer*
9. **Sri Ramesh Chandra-I**, placed at Sl. No. 233 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 600 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
10. **Sri Ravindra Nath Mishra**, placed at Sl. No. 592 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 747 - of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
11. **Sri Shiladiya Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 566 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 748 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
12. **Sri Daya Shanker Tripathi**, placed at Sl. No. 641 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 749 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity of filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
13. **Sri B.K. Srivastava-III**, placed at Sl. No. 461 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 1025 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
14. **Sri U.N. Singh**, placed at Sl. No. 599 in the TSL has preferred his no objections (page no. 1026 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
15. **Sri S.M.A. Abidi**, placed at Sl. No. 221 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 1063 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection may be given if his seniority is to be down paste.*
16. **Sri Ved Pal**, placed at Sl. No. 30 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 1191 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection may be given if his seniority is to be down paste.*
17. **Sri A.K. Chaudhary**, placed at Sl. No. 115 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 1197 of the compilation) as under: -  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*
18. **Sri V.P. Gaur**, placed at Sl. No. 201 in the TSL has preferred his no objection (page no. 1446 of the compilation) as under:  
*Opportunity for filing objection and hearing may be given if his seniority is to be down placed.*

*None except Sri A.K. Roopanwal (Sl. No. 1) and Sri Ajai Kumar Singh (Sl. No. 6) have been adversely affected by the decision taken by the Committee out of above mentioned officers. Sri A.K. Roopanwal and Sri Ajai Kumar Singh, now Hon'ble Judges of this Court have been elevated to the Bench after their Lordships preferred their representations.*

**G. Objections preferred by Officers of Higher Judicial Service for correction of mistakes and omissions in TSL:**

1. **Sri R P. Pandey**, placed at Sl. No. 87 in the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 7 of the compilation) as under: -

Name has been wrongly transcribed as Rajendra Prasad Pandey, Correction accordingly solicited.

*The Committee has accepted the request of Sri R.P. Pandey vide resolution dated 18.9.2006*

2. **Sri Tarkeshwar Nath Pandey**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 86-89 of the compilation) as under: -

According to him, he is working in HJS since 26-05-2000. His name should have been placed between Sl. No. 573 Sri Jagendra Singh and Sl. No. 574 Sri Ravindra Bhaskar.

*The Committee has accepted the request of Sri Pandey for his placement at Sl. No. 573-A of the TSL vide resolution dated 18.9.2006.*

3. **Sri G.S. Pathak**, has preferred his objections (page nos. 601-602 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has stated that in view of Court's notification dated 17-5-05 he has joined in HJS under Rule 22 (1) on 21-5-05.
2. His name does not find place in the TSL.
3. He is entitled to be included in the seniority list after Sri A.N. Upadhyay (Sl. No. 475).

*The Committee has accepted the request of Sri Pandey for his placement at Sl. No. 474-A of the TSL vide resolution dated 18.9.2006.*

4. **Sri V.P. Singh-II**, placed at Sl. No. 48 in the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 634-641 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under: -

1. He has stated that he was removed from service vide removal order dated 11-7-98.
2. In WP No. 34689 of 1997 decided on 31-8-2001 removal order dated 11-7-98 was quashed and he was reinstated in the service vide Vijendra Pal Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another {(2001) 3 UPLBEC 2659..
3. In the remark's column of the TSL, it has wrongly been mentioned that he was re-appointed on 15-3-2002.
4. He has prayed that words (re-appointed on 15-3-2002) be struck off and words "removal order dated 11-7-98 was quashed and re-instated with continuity of service and with all consequential benefits such as payment of arrears of salary and other benefits, as admissible under the Rules, in accordance with order dated 31-08-01 in judgement dated 31.8.2001 passed in CM WP No. 34689 of 1997 by the Hon'ble High Court, Allahabad be substituted.

*Remarks mentioned in column 7 in the TSL against his name be deleted and words "reinstated in accordance with direction in judgement passed in C.M.W.P. No. 34689 of 1997 by the High Court, Allahabad" be substituted.*

5. **Smt. Vijay Lakshmi**, placed at Sl. No. 291 of the TSL has preferred her objections (page nos. 257-259 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by her in brief are as under:

1. She has been allotted vacancy occurred on 31.1.1989. She is entitled to get her seniority fixed from this date.
2. Promotee officers placed above her have been allotted seniority subsequent to 31.1.1989.

3. She has stated that her name has been incorrectly spelt in the TSL; she has prayed that spelling of her name be corrected as Smt. Vijay Lakshmi.
4. She has prayed that her seniority be fixed some where near the year 1989 as for her vacancy occurred on 31-1-1989 has been allotted. In the alternative she has prayed that her name should be placed at Sl. No. 233.

*Request for correction of spelling mistake in her name has been accepted by the Committee vide resolution dated 18.9.2006. Her other grounds have been dealt with at their proper place.*

6. **Sri V.K. Tyagi**, placed at Sl. No. 462 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 262-264 of the compilation) as under:

He has stated that in the TSL his date of joining under Rule 22 (1) has been wrongly shown as 21-8-05 instead of 21-5-05. He is working as Additional District & Sessions Judge on ad-hoc basis since February 1999. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 8-9-1997. Therefore, he may be treated as promoted under Rule 22(1) w.e.f. 20-2-99 and his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*He has requested for correction in column no. 3. In place of "21-08-2005" he has requested that 21-05-2005 be shown as his date of appointment.*

*He has been substantively appointed in HJS vide Court Notification dated 17-05-2005 his date of joining is 21-05-2005. His request for correction of date is granted and in place of "21-08-2005" in column nos. 3 & 6 "21-05-2005" be written. His other grounds have been dealt with at their proper place.*

7. **Sri B.C. Saxena**, placed at Sl. No. 475 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page no. 2018 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. Spelling of his name has not been shown correctly in the TSL.
2. TSL has not been prepared according to direction in S.K. Tripathi's case.
3. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 12-9-97. He has been promoted to HJS on 12-2-1999.
4. He has requested that he must be treated to be promoted under Rule 22 (1) w.e.f. 12-2-99. and his seniority be fixed accordingly.

*B.C. Saxena (TSL no. 475) has requested for correction of his name. Request for correction is granted. in place of "Brijesh Chand Saxena" "Brijesh Chandra Saxena" be written. His other grounds have been dealt with at their proper place.*

8. **Sri M.P. Yadav**, placed at Sl. No. 618 of the TSL has preferred his objections (page nos. 2031-2032 of the compilation). The grounds mentioned by him in brief are as under:

1. He has been allotted vacancy occurred on 11-10-99, he was promoted under Rule 22 (3) on 27-3-01, he has joined as ADJ under Rule 22 (1) on 30-5-05.
2. His seniority has been fixed from May 2005 whereas he is entitled to have his seniority counted from 11-10-99.
3. He has requested that seniority list be corrected accordingly.

*M.P. Yadav (TSL no. 618) has requested that date of his substantive appointment has been shown in the column no. 3 of the TSL as "05-2005" whereas he had taken charge on 30-05-2005. His request to this extent is granted, his date of substantive appointment in column 3 & 6 be corrected as prayed. His other grounds have been dealt with at their proper place.*

Sd/-                      Sd/-                      Sd/-                      Sd/-                      Sd/-  
(S.S. Kulshrestha)    (Ashok Bhushan)    (Sunil Ambwani)    (R.K. Agarwal)    (B.S. Chauhan)

**Seniority List of the Officers of U.P.Higher Judicial Service Promoted from U.P.  
Nyayik Sewa/ Recruited Directly from the Bar after Sri S.K.Ratoori**

Sl.No.	Name of the Officer	Date of continuous officiation	Date of Joining of Direct Recruits from the Bar	Date of availability of vacancy/ caused by	Date relevant for seniority	Remarks
1.	Narendra Singh		9.10.85	28.2.82 Retirement of Sri Jamuna Prasad Singh	April, 1984	Notional Compulsory retired on 15.7.96
2.	Krishna Kumar-III		5.10.85	1.4.82 Retirement of Sri Kripa Shanker Dubey	April, 1984	Notional Retired on 31.12.2000
3.	Umesh Chandra Tiwari		5.10.85	30.4.82 Retirement of Sri Lorinda Ram Kohil	April, 1984	Notional
4.	Udhav Singh		5.10.85	30.6.82 Retirement of Sri R.C.Verma	April, 1984	Notional Retired on 31.10.2004
5.	Ashok Kumar Roopanwal	18.5.85		24.5.84 Elevation of Sri G.B.Singh	18.5.85	
6.	Yashwant Singh Sengar	18.5.85		31.7.84 Retirement of Sri Rameshwar Nath Agarwal	18.5.85	Retired on 31.1.2001
7.	Rajendra Prasad Srivastava-II	10.7.85		31.7.84 Retirement of Sri S.S.Srivastava	10.7.85	

8.	Umesh Chandra Misra	16.7.85		3.8.84 Death of Sri Krishna Kumar Sharma	16.7.85	Compulsory retired on 14.2.2002
9.	Ajay Kumar Singh	11.7.85		31.8.84 Retirement of Sri Ram Ratan Agarwal	11.7.85	
10.	Faheem Ahmad Khan	19.7.85		21.9.84 Creation of two posts of Joint Registrar (Rajbhasa), High Court, Allahabad & Lucknow under G.O. No. 1957/ VII-High Court-18/84 dated 21.9.84	19.7.85	Compulsory retired on 4.7.2000
11.	Abhimanyu Kumar	20.7.85		31.10.84 Retirement of Sri R.K.Agarwal	20.7.85	Retired on 31.1.2005
12.	Suresh Chandra Chaurasia	17.7.85		31.12.84 Retirement of Sri B.B.L.Hajelay	17.7.85	
13.	Rajveer Singh-I	22.7.85		31.1.85 Retirement of Sri I.P.Mittal	22.7.85	Retired on 31.5.2006
14.	Radhey Shyam Chaubey	20.7.85		31.1.85 Retirement of Sri Uma Shanker Pandey	20.7.85	
15.	Suresh Chandra Tyagi		7.10.85	31.7.82 Retirement of Sri Ram Prakash Pandey	7.10.85	Retired on 31.8.92
16.	Ratnakar Dixit	24.11.85		31.1.85 Retirement of Sri P.P.Mathur	24.11.85	Retired on 31.3.2005
17.	Jang Bahadur Singh-II	26.8.86		6.2.85 Creation of one post of Deputy Secretary (Law) & Deputy L.R. (Law Cell), Delhi Under O.M. No. 1122/VII-High Court-23(ESTV)/84 dated 6.2.85	26.8.86	Died on 10.11.96



18.	Vajahat Ali	28.8.86		15.2.85 Creation of One post of Spl. Secretary (Law) & Addl. L.R. Government of U.P. Lucknow under G.O. NO. 715/II-4-85 dated 15.2.85	28.8.86	Retired on 31.7.2003
19.	Udai Bhan Singh	30.8.86		28.2.85 Retirement of Sri Ram Chandra Verma	30.8.86	Retired on 31.12.2002
20.	Syed Nazim Husain Zaidi	30.8.86		31.3.85 Retirement of Sri Prahlad Narain	30.8.86	
21.	Narendra Bahadur Singh	31.8.86		30.4.85 Retirement of Sri R.B.L.Khandelwal	31.8.86	Retired on 30.6.2002
22.	Vimal Kishore	25.8.86		31.5.85 Retirement of Sri S.M.A.Khusaroo	25.8.86	
23.	Brij Mohan Joshi	30.8.86		31.5.85 Retirement of Sri Ram Chandra Gupta	30.8.86	Died on 3.2.2000
24.	Aditya Prakash Sharma	3.9.86		31.5.85 Retirement of Sri K.P.Nigam	3.9.86	Retired on 31.7.2005
25.	Raghuvansh Mani Rai	18.9.86		30.6.85 Retirement of Sri H.C.Rastogi	18.9.86	Died on 24.4.99
26.	Rama Shanker Srivastava	10.9.86		30.6.85 Retirement of Sri R.K.Garg	10.9.86	Retired on 31.12.2003
27.	Vishal Chandra Saxena	31.8.86		30.6.85 Retirement of Sri S.N.Lal	31.8.86	Retired on 30.4.2004
28.	Ved Pal	30.8.86		31.7.85 Retirement of Sri K.P.Asthana	30.8.86	

29.	Subodh Kumar Bhatt	30.8.86		31.7.85 Retirement of Sri G.L.Tandon	30.8.86	
30.	Brahma Nand Shukla	26.8.86		31.8.85 Retirement of Sri Parmatma Saroop	26.8.86	
31.	Raj Mani Chauhan	28.8.86		31.8.85 Retirement of Sri V.C.Jain	28.8.86	
32.	Udai Chandra	6.9.86		31.8.85 Retirement of Sri B.P.Srivastava	6.9.86	Retired on 31.1.99
33.	Asharaf Jamal Siddiqui	5.9.86		31.8.85 Retirement of Sri Jai Shanker Pandey	5.9.86	
34.	Satya Narain Pandey	26.8.86		6.9.85 Death of Sri U.S.Gupta	26.8.86	Retired on 31.3.97
35.	Km. Ujjawala Garg	31.8.86		30.11.85 Retirement of Sri Anand Prakash Agarwal	31.8.86	
36.	Om Prakash Bansal	30.8.86		30.11.85 Retirement of Sri C.B.Shah	30.8.86	Died on 27.4.2000
37.	Sabhapati Singh	28.8.86		30.11.85 Retirement of Sri R.S.Mathur	28.8.86	
38.	Ram Autar	28.8.86		30.11.85 Retirement of Sri G.S.Nema	28.8.86	Retired on 31.12.2005
39.	Amar Sinha	28.8.86		26.12.85 Creation of one post of Chairman Administrative Tribunal-III & Member Admin. Tribunal-I, U.P., Lucknow under G.O.NO. 5784/II-&-Ka-156/75	28.8.86	

				dated 26.12.85		
40.	Suraj Singh Raudra	28.8.86		26.12.85 Creation of one post of Member Administrative Tribunal-II & III, U.P., Lucknow under G.O.NO. 5784/II-&Ka-156/75 dated 26.12.85	28.8.86	
41.	Swatantra Singh	1.9.86		31.12.85 Retirement of Sri Om Prakash-II	1.9.86	
42.	Suresh Chandra Dixit		6.12.86	31.8.82 Retirement of Sri Riksheshwari Prasad	6.12.86	Opted Uttaranchal
43.	Nirvikar Gupta		6.12.86	6.10.82 Creation of 50 Courts vide G.O.No. dated 6.10.82	6.12.86	
44.	Hari Shanker Lal Srivastava		6.12.86	6.10.82 Creation of 50 Courts vide G.O.No. dated 6.10.82	6.12.86	Compulsory retired on 7.5.98
45.	Bipin Chandra Kandpal		4.12.86	6.10.82 Creation of 50 Courts vide G.O.No. dated 6.10.82	4.12.86	Opted Uttaranchal
46.	Vijendra Pal Singh-II		7.12.86	6.10.82 Creation of 50 Courts vide G.O.No. dated 6.10.82	7.12.86	Reinstated in accordance with direction in judgment passed in C.M.W.P. No. 34689 of 1997 by the High Court, Allahabad
47.	Ram Dass		4.12.86	30.6.84 Retirement of Sri Bipin Chandra	4.12.86	Opted Uttaranchal
48.	Shiv Murti Pandey		25.1.88	31.7.84 Retirement of Sri Chhotey Lal Jatav	Dece., 1986	Notional Retired on 31.7.2002
49.	Girish Chandra Awasthi		27.1.88	31.7.84 Retirement of Sri S.N.Tandon	Dece., 1986	Notional

50.	Ram Kishore Gupta		25.1.88	31.8.84 Retirement of Sri R.S.Agarwal	Dece., 1986	Notional Retired on 31.12.2001
51.	Pooran Singh		25.1.88	21.9.84 Creation of two post of Joint Registrar(Rajbhasha), High Court, Allahabad & Lucknow under G.O.No. 1957/VII-HC-18/84 dated 21.9.84	Dece., 1986	Notionnal Compulsory retirred on 17.5.2005
52.	Udai Chand Dixit	11.3.87		31.12.85 Retirement of Sri Sudama Prasad Srivastava	11.3.87	Died on 23.2.94
53.	Shiv Kumar Gautam	31.3.87		31.12.85 Retirement of Sri S.B.L.Kacker	31.3.87	Opted Uttaranchal
54.	Suresh Chandra-III	18.4.87		31.12.85 Retirement of Sri B.B.S.Chaudhary	18.4.87	Retired on 31.1.2002
55.	Kishan Singh	20.3.87		31.12.85 Retirement of Sri Radhey Shyam Verma	20.3.87	Retired on 30.11.2001
56.	Aditya Kumar Saxena	4.4.87		9.1.86 Elevation to Bench of Sri B.L.Loomba	4.4.87	
57.	Chandra Bhan Dutt Misra	21.3.87		31.1.86 Retirement of Sri Krishna Nand Srivastava	21.3.87	
58.	Ras Behari Lal	21.3.87		31.3.86 Retirement of Sri Rejeshwar Singh	21.3.87	Retired on 30.6.2002
59.	Ashok Kumar Rastogi	21.3.87		31.5.86 Retirement of Sri N.K.Maheshwari	21.3.87	
60.	Rajendra Prasad Tripathi	19.3.87		30.6.86 Retirement of Sri L.S.P.Singh	19.3.87	
61.	Awadhesh Narain Dwivedi	19.3.87		31.7.86 Retirement of Sri K.C.Singh	19.3.87	Retired on 31.1.2003
62.	Subhash Kumar Saxena	11.3.87		31.7.86 Retirement of Sri H.P.Pathak	11.3.87	

63.	Indra Bahadur Singh	31.3.87		6.8.86 Creation of 4 posts, Viz. Director-1, Additional Director-1 Joint Director-2, in JTRI, U.P. Lucknow under G.O. No. 2034/VII-HC/86-54/Dated 6.8.86	31.3.87	Retired on 31.7.2003
64.	Ajai Kumar Sinha	31.3.87		31.8.86 Retirement of Sri Sushil Kumar Agarwal	31.3.87	
65.	Rajesh Chandra	19.3.87		31.10.86 Retirement of Sri R.C.Agarwal	19.3.87	
66.	Vinod Kumar-I	31.3.87		30.11.86 Retirement of Sri G.N.Saxena	31.3.87	Retired on 30.6.2006
67.	Sayeed Ahmad Siddiqui	21.3.87		12.12.86 Creation of 5 Courts/posts of Addl. D.J. in district Mirzapur for Banwasi Court created under G.O.No. 7534/VII-AN-742/86, Dated 12.12.86	21.3.87	
68.	Jai Prakash Agarwal-II	29.3.87		12.12.86 Creation of 5 Courts/posts of Addl. D.J. in district Mirzapur for Banwasi Court created under G.O.No. 7534/VII-AN-742/86, Dated 12.12.86	29.3.87	Retired on 31.1.2004
69.	Rajendra Prasad Shukla-I	21.3.87		28.2.87 Retirement of Sri Arjun Deo	21.3.87	
70.	Shyam Behari Lal	12.3.87		31.3.87 Retirement of Sri M.M.Lal	31.3.87	Died on 12.7.96
71.	Rajendra Swaroop Kashyap	19.3.87		30.4.87 Retirement of Sri S.A.Abbasi	30.4.87	Compulsory retired on 17.5.2005
72.	Smt. Sadhana Chaudhary	21.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	Dismissed on 17.1.2006
73.	Rakesh Dutt	29.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	Died on 31.5.95
74.	Sardar Akhtar	21.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	

75.	Vimal Kumar Jain	14.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	Opted Uttaranchal
76.	Uma Kant Khare	13.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	Retired on 31.5.2002
77.	Shyam Shanker Tewari	26.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	
78.	Mohd. Farooque Omar	28.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	Retired on 31.12.2005
79.	Shiv Kailash Pandey	26.3.87		27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	27.6.87	
80.	Sudhir Kumar-I	26.3.87		30.6.87 Retirement of Sri G.A.Farooqui	30.6.87	
81.	Awadhendra Pratap Singh	27.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Compulsory retired 17.5.2005
82.	Uma Kant Tripathi	12.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Retired on 30.11.2004
83.	Arunjeet Lal Verma	28.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Voluntary retired on 30.4.2005
84.	Virendra Bahadur Rai	27.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Opted Uttaranchal
85.	Rajeshwar Prasad Pandey	30.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	
86.	Arun Kumar Jain	20.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	

87.	Narendra Ojha	22.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Retired on 31.7.2003
88.	Darshan Lal Sharma	31.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	Retired on 31.3.2005
89.	Piyush Kumar	31.3.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.7.87	
90.	Yogendra Kumar Sangal	31.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.87	
91.	Sant Lal Ram	26.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	26.10.87	Retired on 29.2.94
92.	Khaliquzzaman Khan	26.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	26.10.87	
93.	Dharam Singh	2.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	2.7.88	Notional
94.	Vishawanath Saran Triapthi	31.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.87	Retired on 31.10.2003
95.	Arun Kumar Srivastava-I	31.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.87	Died on 27.4.2004
96.	Ram Murti (Bajpai)	.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	.10.87	Retired on 31.12.2004
97.	Ansar Ahmad Siddiqui	31.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.87	Retired on 31.7.2005
98.	Vichitra Kumar	30.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve	30.10.87	

				under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87		
99.	Ram Nath	26.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	26.10.87	
100.	Subhash Chandra-I	31.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.87	
101.	Chandra Bhal Srivastava	27.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	27.10.87	
102.	Qazi Gufran Ali	26.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	26.10.87	Retired on 31.1.2005
103.	Kashi Nath Pandey	29.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	29.10.87	
104.	Ajay Govind Lal	30.10.87		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	30.10.87	Retired on 30.9.2003
105.	Raj Kumar	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Compulsory retired on 17.5.2005
106.	Hausla Prasad Pandey	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 31.7.2004
107.	Virendra Kumar Khare	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 30.6.2003
108.	Ashok Kumar Chaudhary	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	
109.	Sunit Kumar Samadhiya	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	



110.	Brijendra Singh-II	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 31.7.2004
111.	Alakh Ram Sharma	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 30.9.2002
112.	Subhash Chandra Bose	2.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	2.7.88	
113.	Ram Lakhan Kesarwani	9.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	9.7.88	
114.	Chandra Prakash-III	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 30.4.2006
115.	Shiv Kumar Maurya	4.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	4.7.88	Retired on 30.6.2003
116.	Sarvesh Kumar Pandey	22.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	22.9.89	Notional
117.	Dr. Chandra Deo Rai	4.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	4.7.88	
118.	Nazar Jalil Khan	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Died on 19.7.95
119.	Bharosi Lal	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Opted Uttaranchal
120.	Kartar Singh	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 31.12.99
121.	Navin Chandra Pushker	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 31.8.2002

122.	Bishmbhar Dayal Singh Srivastava	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 28.2.2001
123.	Yad Ram-II	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 31.7.2005
124.	Shyam Lal Jayant	9.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	9.7.88	Retired on 31.7.98
125.	Phool Singh-II	1.7.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.7.88	Retired on 30.9.2002
126.	Brijendra Singh Yadava	24.12.88		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	24.12.88	Removed on 30.4.97 Reinstated on 24.7.2000
127.	Om Prakash Misra-I	1.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	1.9.89	Retired on 28.2.2002
128.	Chintamani Dungrakoti	29.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	29.8.89	Retired on 31.1.99
129.	Mahendra Pal Singh Tejan	11.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	11.9.89	Retired on 28.2.2001
130.	Moti Lal-I	30.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	30.8.89	Retired on 31.12.2004
131.	Ram Naresh Ram	31.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.8.89	Dismissed on 16.1.99
132.	Har Charan	31.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.8.89	Retired on 31.1.2000
133.	Ram Das Nimesh	30.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve	30.8.89	

				under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87		
134.	Chhatra Pal Singh	26.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	26.8.89	Retired on 31.7.98
135.	Tufani	25.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	25.8.89	Retired on 31.3.2002
136.	Pitamber Singh	29.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	29.8.89	
137.	Naresh Chandra	25.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	25.8.89	Retired on 30.4.2002
138.	Ajai Pal Singh	30.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	30.9.89	
139.	Rajesh Kumar Malviya	28.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.8.89	Compulsory retired on 17.5.2005
140.	Rajendra Prasad Pandey-II	25.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	25.8.89	Opted Uttranchal
141.	Virendra Singh	31.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.8.89	
142.	Uttam Singh Pangati	30.8.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	30.8.89	Retired on 30.9.99
143.	Ram Jiwan Gupta	21.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	21.9.89	Retired on 31.8.2002
144.	Naval Singh	22.9.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	22.9.89	Compulsory retired on 11.2.99

145.	Vinod Kumar Jain-II	10.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	10.11.89	Voluntary retired on 31.3.2001
146.	Rafiquddin	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Voluntary retired on 4.8.99
147.	Siddh Nath Pandey	25.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	25.10.89	Retired on 31.1.2003
148.	Vinod Kumar Bishnoi	17.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	17.11.89	Retired on 28.2.2001
149.	Ajit Kumar Tewari	24.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	24.10.89	Retired on 30.6.2005
150.	Ram Dawar Singh	16.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	16.11.89	Retired on 31.1.2001
151.	Ghan Shyam Pandey-II	6.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	6.11.89	Retired on 30.6.2005
152.	Rama Kant Sharma	30.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	30.10.89	Opted Uttaranchal
153.	Mahendra Tewari	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Retired on 31.7.2003
154.	Shrish Kumar Srivastava	29.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	29.10.89	Retired on 31.5.2005
155.	Rishi Prakash Verma	4.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	4.11.89	Opted Uttaranchal
156.	Ravi Narain	25.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve	25.10.89	Retired on 31.10.2002

				under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87		
157.	Rajendra Prasad Shukla-II	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Retired on 31.7.2004
158.	Sheo Pratap Narain Asthana	31.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	31.10.89	Removed on 25.2.2002
159.	Hamant Chandra Seth	29.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	29.10.89	Retired on 31.7.2005
160.	Shivaji Srivastava	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Retired on 31.8.2003
161.	Jai Prakash Narain-II	4.11.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	4.11.89	Retired on 31.12.2001
162.	Krishna Chandra	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Retired on 30.9.2004
163.	Surendra Prasad Tyagi	28.10.89		10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	28.10.89	Retired on 30.4.99
164.	Sahaj Ram Singh	7.11.89		25.7.87 Creation of one post of Chairman U.P. Cooperative Tribunal, Lucknow under G.O.No 823/II-4-22(13)/84 dated 25.7.87	7.11.89	Compulsory retired on 20.3.97
165.	Chaturbhuji Narain Singh	27.10.89		31.7.87 Elevation to Bench of Sri H.C.Mittal	27.10.89	Retired on 30.6.2004
166.	Prabhat Kumar Sharma	8.5.90		31.7.87 Elevation to Bench of Sri G.K.Mathur	8.5.90	Died on 2.11.92
167.	Vijendra Pal Singh-I	12.5.90		31.7.87 Elevation to Bench of Sri S.R.Bhargava	12.5.90	

168.	Satya Narain Singh-I	20.5.90		31.7.87 Elevation to Bench of Sri K.K.Birla	20.5.90	Retired on 31.1.99
169.	Dina Nath Sinha	.5.90		31.7.87 Retirement of Sri Brahma Kishore	.5.90	Died on 20.10.92
170.	Prani Dutt Dhaundiya	17.5.90		31.7.87 Retirement of Sri B.N.Sinha	17.5.90	Retired on 31.3.2001
171.	Yashwant Singh	17.5.90		31.8.87 Creation of one post of Joint Director(Research) J.T.R.I., U.P., Lucknow under G.O.No. 959/VII- HC/55/86 dated 31.8.87	17.5.90	Retired on 31.3.2000
172.	Jeewan Chandra Singh Rawat	11.5.90		31.10.87 Retirement of Sri K.K.Chaubey	11.5.90	Opted Uttaranchal
173.	Praful Chandra Pant	12.5.90		31.10.87 Retirement of Sri Usha Kant Verma	12.5.90	Opted Uttaranchal
174.	Kushal Shanker Ojha	15.5.90		31.1.88 Retirement of Sri Ram Ji Lal	15.5.90	Retired on 30.6.2005
175.	Jagdish Chandra-III	11.5.90		31.3.88 Retirement of Sri Surendra Kumar Jain-I	11.5.90	Retired on 30.4.99
176.	Avadhesh Rai	10.5.90		30.4.88 Retirement of Sri Vikramaditya Kulshrestha	10.5.90	Retired on 31.12.2005
177.	Devendra Kumar Jain	11.5.90		31.10.88 Retirement of Sri Ram Chandra Gupta-I	11.5.90	Retired on 31.12.2000
178.	Tahir Ali	22.5.90		30.11.88 Retirement of Sri Brij Pal Singh	22.5.90	Retired on 31.5.99
179.	Gulab Singh Rathor	14.5.90		4.1.89 Elevation to Bench of Sri Shrinath Sahay Srivastava	14.5.90	
180.	Vijai Prakash Govil	19.1.91		31.3.89 Retirement of Sri G.D.Dubey	19.1.91	Retired on 31.7.99
181.	Ram Sagar Verma-I	15.3.91		31.5.89 Retirement of Sri S.K.Bhargava	15.3.91	Retired on 31.12.99

182.	Kamta Prasad Misra	19.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	19.3.91	Retired on 31.1.2004
183.	Ram Shanker Dikshit	20.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	20.3.91	Retired on 31.3.2002
184.	Vijai Bahadur Srivastava	23.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	23.3.91	Compulsory retired on 14.8.97
185.	Ramesh Chandra Gautam	23.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	23.3.91	Retired on 31.8.2003
186.	Ahmad Shamim	25.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	25.3.91	Died on 8.11.2005
187.	Rameshwar Singh	27.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	27.3.91	Retired on 31.7.2001
188.	Ashok Kumar Mathur	26.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	26.3.91	
189.	Mohd. Quraish Siddiqui	29.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	29.3.91	Retired on 31.7.2000
190.	Ved Prakash Gaur	30.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to	30.3.91	

				upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89		
191.	Ram Autar Singh-II	23.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	23.3.91	
192.	Mahesh Chandra-I	19.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	19.3.91	Retired on 31.10.99
193.	Shesh Narain Dubey	25.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	25.3.91	Retired on 31.1.2005
194.	Naresh Kumar Singh	20.3.91		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	20.3.91	Voluntary retired on 25.4.2005
195.	Gyan Saran Nema	17.5.94		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	17.5.94	Compulsory retired on 7.5.98
196.	Pratap Singh-I	13.5.94		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	13.5.94	Retired on 31.10.2003
197.	Kshama Dutt Vashishtha	17.5.94		30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	17.5.94	Died on 11.6.95
198.	Mohd. Azhar Khan	13.5.94		30.6.89 One post of Joint Registrar(Computer), High Court Allahabad created under G.O.No.12/VII-HC/61/88, Dated 30.6.89	13.5.94	Retired on 31.3.2002



199.	Krishna Kumar-II	12.5.94		1.8.89 Voluntary retirement of Sri Jageshwar Prasad	12.5.94	Retired on 31.7.2001
200.	Smt. Jaishree Tewari	12.5.94		31.8.89 Retirement of Sri S.R.Sagar	12.5.94	
201.	Krishna Kumar Yadav	12.5.94		21.10.89 Creation of 5 courts/ posts of D.Js. For Hardwar, Mau, Siddharthnagar, Sonbhadra &Firozabad underG.O.No.110/VII-AVA-UN-204/89,Dt.21.10.89	12.5.94	Retired on 31.8.2000
202.	Hare Ram Pathak	18.5.94		21.10.89 Creation of 5 courts/ posts of D.Js. For Hardwar, Mau, Siddharthnagar, Sonbhadra &Firozabad underG.O.No.110/VII-AVA-UN-204/89,Dt.21.10.89	18.5.94	Died on 28.11.94
203.	Som Dutt (Arora)	12.5.94		21.10.89 Creation of 5 courts/ posts of D.Js. For Hardwar, Mau, Siddharthnagar, Sonbhadra &Firozabad underG.O.No.110/VII-AVA-UN-204/89,Dt.21.10.89	12.5.94	Retired on 31.7.2000
204.	Subhash Chandra Agrawal	16.5.94		21.10.89 Creation of 5 courts/ posts of D.Js. For Hardwar, Mau, Siddharthnagar, Sonbhadra &Firozabad underG.O.No.110/VII-AVA-UN-204/89,Dt.21.10.89	16.5.94	
205.	Khagesh Bahadur	21.5.94		21.10.89 Creation of 5 courts/ posts of D.Js. For Hardwar, Mau, Siddharthnagar, Sonbhadra &Firozabad underG.O.No.110/VII-AVA-UN-204/89,Dt.21.10.89	21.5.94	Retired on 31.1.2006
206.	Chandra Bhan-I	12.5.94		31.12.89 Voluntary retirement of Sri J.P.Sharma	12.5.94	Retired on 31.8.2000
207.	Yogesh Chandra Gupta	17.5.94		12.1.90 reation of one court/ post of D.J.Maharajganj, underG.O. No.5823/VII-AN-217/89 dated 12.1.90	17.5.94	
208.	Riyazuddin	12.5.94		31.1.90 Retirement of Sri L.N.Rai	12.5.94	Retired on 31.1.2006
209.	Radhey Shyam Pandey	15.5.94		31.1.90 Retirement of Sri M.K.Singal	15.5.94	Retired on 31.12.2000

210.	Syed Mazhar Abbas Abidi	6.5.94		1.3.90 Lien Termination of Sri Ram Swaroop	6.5.94	
211.	Chandra Nath Misra	13.5.94		31.3.90 Retirement of Sri K.M.Pandey	13.5.94	
212.	Harish Chandra-II	12.5.94		30.4.90 Retirement of Sri I.N.Thakral	12.5.94	Voluntary retired on 31.3.2002
213.	Shree Kant Tripathi	6.5.94		31.5.90 Retirement of Sri P.P.Gupta	6.5.94	
214.	Raj Veer Singh-II	12.5.94		31.5.90 Retirement of Sri S.N.Prasad	12.5.94	Retired on 31.7.99
215.	Nalin Mohan Lal	12.5.94		6.7.90 Elevation to Bench of Sri J.K.Mathur	12.5.94	
216.	Ashok Srivastava	12.5.94		6.7.90 Elevation to Bench of Sri K.C.Bhargava	12.5.94	
217.	Ramesh Shanker	12.5.94		6.7.90 Elevation to Bench of Sri Krishna Narayan	12.5.94	
218.	Krishna Deo Srivastava	12.5.94		6.7.90 Elevation to Bench of Sri Surya Prasad	12.5.94	Reverted on 27.10.2005
219.	Maskoor Hasan Khan	11.5.94		6.7.90 Elevation to Bench of Sri V.N.Mehrotra	11.5.94	Retired on 30.4.2006
220.	Chandra Bhushan Pandey	13.5.94		31.7.90 Retirement of Sri R.K.Agarwal	13.5.94	Dismissed on 17.6.98
221.	Om Prakash Dwivedi	12.5.94		31.7.90 Retirement of Sri Goverdhan Lal Gupta	12.5.94	Retired on 30.4.2001
222.	Ramesh Chandra-I	12.5.94		31.8.90 Retirement of Sri H.C.Saxena	12.5.94	
223.	Kali Shanker Shukla	18.5.94		31.8.90 Retirement of Sri B.L.Sachdeva	18.5.94	Retired on 31.7.2003

224.	Babu Singh Rajpoot	17.5.94		31.8.90 Retirement of Sri Maharaj Din	17.5.94	Retired on 30.4.99
225.	Nayaz Ahmad-I	13.5.94		28.10.90 Death of Sri Lakshmi Kant Upadhyay	13.5.94	Retired on 30.6.2006
226.	Chhatra Pal Singh	11.5.94		31.10.90 Retirement of Sri Laxmi Narayan Agarwal	11.5.94	Retired on 31.4.2000
227.	Radhey Lal Yadav	12.5.94		12.11.90 Death of Sri Kamal Narain Upadhyay	12.5.94	Compulsory retired on 17.5.2005
228.	Narendra Kumar Jain	13.5.94		31.12.90 Creation of 1 post of Addl. Registrar(Inspection) High Court, Allahabad under G.O.No.4218/VII-AN-1-69/90 dated 31.12.90	13.5.94	
229.	Hari Mangal Singh	13.5.94		31.12.90 Creation of 3 posts of Joint Registrar, High Court but 2 Posts of Joint Registrar diverted to office High Court, Allahabad created under G.O.No.4218/ VII-AN-1-69/90 dated 31.12.90	13.5.94	
230.	Mam Chand	13.5.94		31.1.91 Retirement of Sri Nirranjan Prasad Verma	13.5.94	Retired on 31.12.2004
231.	Hirdey Narain Misra	19.5.94		17.6.91 Death of Sri Tirath Raj	19.5.94	
232.	Arun Kumar Malviya	17.5.94		30.6.91 Retirement of Sri Praduman Kumar Dixit	17.5.94	Retired on 30.6.2006
233.	Syed Khalid Idris Naqvi	12.5.94		27.11.91 Elevation to Bench of Sri Karan Lal Sharma	12.5.94	Voluntary retired on 3.8.99
234.	Muzafar Husain	17.5.94		31.1.92 Retirement of Sri Mohan Singh	17.5.94	Voluntary retired on 27.9.2003
235.	Ghan Shyam Shukla	16.5.94		31.1.92 Retirement of Sri Lavkush Saran Shukla	16.5.94	Retired on 30.6.2002
236.	Mata Prasad Gupta	13.5.94		4.2.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri A..S.Tripathi	13.5.94	Retired on 31.7.2003

237.	Vashistha Prasad Shukla	12.5.94		4.2.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri Ishwar Saran Mathur	12.5.94	
238.	Virendra Kumar Dikshit	11.5.94		28.2.92 Retirement of Sri Sushil Kumar Srivastava-I	11.5.94	
239.	Ram Prakash Lavaniya	12.5.94		28.2.92 Retirement of Sri Ram Shanker Pandey	12.5.94	
240.	Subhash Chand Mangla	12.5.94		28.2.92 Retirement of Sri Jaswant Singh	12.5.94	
241.	Zamir Uddin	24.5.94		30.4.92 Retirement of Sri Ramesh Chandra Srivastava	24.5.94	Voluntary retired on 31.3.2001
242.	Vinay Kumar Mathur		13.5.94	31.10.84 Retirement of Sri D.P.Srivastava	13.5.94	
243.	Dinesh Gupta		12.5.94	31.12.84 Retirement of Sri R.S.L.Srivastava	12.5.94	
244.	Anil Kumar Srivastava-III		12.5.94	31.1.85 Retirement of Sri M.G.Godbole	12.5.94	
245.	Km. Manju Nigam		12.5.94	31.1.85 Retirement of Sri B.B.Khare	12.5.94	
246.	Shivanand Mishra		12.5.94	31.1.86 Retirement of Sri Baij Nath Misra	12.5.94	
247.	Surendra Kumar		13.5.94	28.2.86 Retirement of Sri Prakash Chandra	13.5.94	
248.	Anil Kumar Agarwal		14.5.94	30.4.86 Retirement of Sri M.M.H.Siddiqui	14.5.94	
249.	Nand Lal Agarwal		12.5.94	30.6.86 Retirement of Sri T.N.Saxena	12.5.94	
250.	Surendra Vikram Singh Rathore		12.5.94	30.6.86 Retirement of Sri M.L.Agarwal	12.5.94	

251.	Sudhir Kumar Saxena		12.5.94	31.7.86 Retirement of Sri B.N.Srivastava	12.5.94	
252.	Kaleemullah Khan		12.5.94	6.8.86 Creation of 4 posts, Viz. Director-1, Additional Director-1, Joint Director-2, in JTRI, U.P. Lucknow under G.O. No. 2034/VII-HC/86-54/Dated 6.8.86.	12.5.94	
253.	Tanveer Ahmad Siddiqui		12.5.94	16.8.86 Elevation to Bench of Sri Virendra Kumar	12.5.94	
254.	Ashok Pal Singh		12.5.94	31.10.86 Retirement of Sri K.G.Rastogi	12.5.94	
255.	Harbansh Kumar Saxena		12.5.94	30.11.86 Retirement of Sri Deen Dayal	12.5.94	
256.	Swaroop Narain Dwivedi		13.5.94	12.12.86 Creation of 5 Courts/posts of Addl. D.J. in district Mirzapur for Banwasi Court created under G.O.No. 7534/VII-AN-742/86, Dated 12.12.86	13.5.94	
257.	Vijay Prakash Pathak		12.5.94	12.12.86 Creation of 5 Courts/posts of Addl. D.J. in district Mirzapur for Banwasi Court created under G.O.No. 7534/VII-AN-742/86, Dated 12.12.86	12.5.94	
258.	Smt. Sandhya Bhatt		11.5.94	31.12.86 Retirement of Sri R.K.Khanna	11.5.94	
259.	Vishnu Cahndra Gupta		13.5.94	28.2.87 Retirement of Sri M.H.Khan	13.5.94	
260.	Yatish Chandra (Gupta)		14.5.94	23.4.87 Retirement of Sri Hem Raj Ram	14.5.94	
261.	Mohammad Tahir		12.5.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	12.5.94	

262.	Narendra Kumar Rajoria		12.5.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	12.5.94	
263.	Dina Nath		12.5.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	12.5.94	
264.	Musaffey Ahmad		12.5.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	12.5.94	
265.	Lalta Prasad-III		12.5.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	12.5.94	
266.	Surendra Pratap Singh	.12.98 11.6.96		31.5.92 Retirement of Sri Yogendra Singh Raizada	11.6.96	Retired on 31.5.2000
267.	Ramesh Kumar Kulshrestha	.12.98 11.6.96		31.5.92 Retirement of Sri Ved Prakash Kalra	11.6.96	Retired on 31.3.2000
268.	Mohan Kumar Bansal	.12.98 10.6.96		30.6.92 Retirement of Sri Shashi Bhushan Sinha	10.6.96	
269.	Shri Prakash Jain	.12.98 11.6.96		7.7.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri Surendra Narain Saxena	11.6.96	Retired on 31.12.2001
270.	Aditya Prasad Chauhan	.12.98 11.6.96		7.7.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri G.S.N.Tripathi	11.6.96	Retired on 30.11.2005
271.	Anant Ram Kureel	21.12.98 12.6.96		7.7.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri Mam Chandra Agarwal	12.6.96	Retired on 31.3.2003
272.	Suresh Kumar Srivastava	.12.98 9.6.96		31.7.92 Retirement of Sri Gopal Krishna Verma	9.6.96	
273.	Hari Har Shukla	.12.98 12.6.96		31.7.92 Retirement of Sri Dharam Singh Ram	12.6.96	Compulsory retired on 1.1.1999
274.	Syed Qutub Uddin	.12.98 7.6.96		31.7.92 Retirement of Sri Prabhu Nath Lal	7.6.96	
275.	Ashok Kumar Kackar	.12.98		31.7.92 Retirement of Sri Ram Behari Lal Dohre	7.6.96	Opted Uttaranchal

		7.6.96				
276.	Subodh Kumar	.12.98 10.6.96		31.8.92 Retirement of Sri Indra Pal singh	10.6.96	
277.	Km. Manju Rani Gupta	.12.98 10.6.96		31.8.92 Retirement of Sri Suresh Chandra Tyagi	10.6.96	Retired on 30.4.2006
278.	Desh Bushan Jain		3.8.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	3.8.96	
279.	Mahendra Dayal		3.8.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	3.8.96	
280.	Virendra Vikram Singh		3.8.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	3.8.96	
281.	Uma Shanker Tomar		3.8.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87	3.8.96	
282.	Het Singh Yadav		3.8.96	10.7.87 Creation of 84 posts of Leave & Deputation reserve under G.O.No. 3920/VII-AN-350/84 dated 10.7.87	3.8.96	
283.	Jitendra Srivastava	25.2.97		20.10.92 Death of Sri D.N.Sinha	25.2.97	Vacancy Reserved vide F.C. 18.11.95
284.	Arvind Kumar Tripathi	23.2.97		2.11.92 Death of Sri Prabhat Kumar Sharma	23.2.97	Vacancy Reserved vide F.C. 18.11.95
285.	Naresh Singh		16.8.97	31.3.88 Retirement of Sri Rajendra Nath Sinha	16.8.97	
286.	Bachchoo Lal		19.8.97	31.3.88 Retirement of Sri Nem Chand Jain-II	19.8.97	
287.	Ashok Kumar		14.8.97	31.7.88 Retirement of Sri D.N.Sharma	14.8.97	
288.	Chhote Lal		14.8.97	31.10.88 Retirement of Sri S.B.Verma	14.8.97	
289.	Manoj Kumar Singhal		15.12.98	31.12.88 Retirement of Sri Nek Shyam Shamsbery	15.12.98	

290.	Smt. Vijay Lakshmi		11.12.98	31.1.89 Retirement of Sri B.D.Maurya	11.12.98	
291.	Pradeep Kumar Saxena		14.12.98	31.3.89 Retirement of Sri Jagdish Narain Tandon	14.12.98	
292.	Ram Briksh Yadav		21.12.98	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	21.12.98	
293.	Mukhtar Ahmad		15.12.98	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	15.12.98	
294.	Arvind Kumar Mishra		14.12.98	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	14.12.98	
295.	Anant Kumar		14.12.98	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	14.12.98	
296.	Amar Singh Chauhan		12.12.98	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89	12.12.98	
297.	Arun Kumar Saxena		15.12.98	1.4.91 Creation of one post/ court of Addl. District. &	15.12.98	



				Sess. Judge(Banwasi) District Mirzapur vide G.O.No. 1270/VII-Nyay-2742/86, Dated 1.4.1991		
298.	Kamal Kishore Sharma		12.12.98	30.6.91 Retirement of Sri Jagdish Mohan Srivastava	12.12.98	
299.	Harsh Kumar		14.12.98	27.11.91 Elevation to Bench of Sri Achal Behari Srivastava	14.12.98	
300.	Ali Zamin		11.12.98	31.1.92 Retirement of Sri Om Prakash -IV	11.12.98	
301.	Rajendra Pal	15.12.98		9.11.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri Narendra Bahadur Asthana	15.12.98	Compulsory retired on 17.5.2005
302.	Umesh Singh		14.12.98	31.1.92 Retirement of Sri Daya Ram Singh	14.12.98	
303.	Ramesh Chandra Tewari	14.12.98		6.12.92 Death of Sri S.C.M.Tripathi	14.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2005
304.	Shashi Kant		14.12.98	4.2.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri S.K.Verma	14.12.98	
305.	Nayaj Ahmad-II	16.12.98 11.6.96		9.12.92 Lien terminated Sri Om Prakash Jain vide A.C. Resolution dated 9.12.92.	16.12.98	Retired on 30.6.2001
306.	Om Prakash		15.12.98	2.4.93 Voluntary retirement of Sri B.B.Agarwal	15.12.98	
307.	Prem Mohan Srivastava	.12.98 10.6.96		2.4.93 Voluntary retirement of Sri Ravindra Nath Sharma	.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2003
308.	Dilip Singh Yadav		14.12.98	8.4.93 Voluntary retirement of Sri J.B.Singh-I	14.12.98	
309.	Ram Chandra Nigam	.12.98 7.6.96		7.4.93 Voluntary retirement of Keshav Saran Srivastava	.12.98	Retired on 31.7.2000
310.	Satya Pal Singh		14.12.98	15.5.93	14.12.98	

				Death of Sri D.M.Arya		
311.	Rama Kant Singh	15.12.98 10.6.96		9.4.93 Voluntary retirement of Sri Girish Chanra	15.12.98	Retired on 30.6.2003
312.	Dharam Veer Singh		15.12.98	26.8.93 Death of Sri Saushil Kumar	15.12.98	
313.	Ashok Kumar-II	.12.98 12.6.96		18.7.93 Death of Sri Sanwal Singh	.12.98	Retired on 31.12.2001
314.	Jai Dev Singh		14.12.98	1.2.94 Elevation to Bench of Sri O.N.Asthana	14.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
315.	Nirmal Kumar Jain	.12.98 12.6.96		7.1.94 Death of Sri K.M.Chaturvedi	.12.98	Retired on 31.8.1999
316.	Babu Ram Varun		14.12.98	1.2.94 Elevation to Bench of Sri Tej Shanker	14.12.98	
317.	Chandra Bhan-II	.12.98 13.6.96		1.2.94 Elevation to Bench of Sri P.K.Sarin	.12.98	Retired on 31.12.2003
318.	Ram Bahadur -I	.12.98 .6.96		23.2.94 Death of Sri U.C. Dixit	.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2005
319.	Chandra Shekhar	.12.98 12.6.96		22.6.94 Voluntary retirement of Sri D.C. Verma	.12.98	Retired on 31.3.2002
320.	Devi Dutt Upadhyaya	.12.98 14.6.96		31.8.94 Voluntary retirement of Sri P.N. Mehrotra	.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
321.	Jai Prakash Narayan-III	.12.98 11.6.96		29.9.94 Elevation to Bench of Sri A.K. Srivastava	.12.98	Retired on 28.2.2006
322.	Satti Din	.12.98 11.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2006
323.	Krishna Kant Tyagi	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.7.2002

324.	Dharam Pal Singh-I	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.10.2002
325.	Pancham Ram	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Died on 30/31.7.2000
326.	Jitendra Singh-I	.12.98 13.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 30.11.1999
327.	Jawahar Lal Kaul	15.12.98 11.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	15.12.98	Retired on 31.1.1999
328.	Lal Chand-I	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2005
329.	Bir Bhan Singh	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.7.2005
330.	Babu Ram	.12.98 12.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79	.12.98	Retired on 30.11.2003

				dated 21.10.94		
331.	Vijai Bahadur Singh	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
332.	Sri Kant Shukla	14.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	14.12.98	Retired on 31.12.2002
333.	Virendra Kumar Maheshwari	12.98 12.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
334.	Prabhuji	.12.98 15.06.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
335.	Jagdish Prasad Srivastava-I	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.8.2002
336.	Jagdish Prasad Gupta-II	.12.98 13.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Died on 1.1.2002
337.	Vijai Bahadur Yadav	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	

338.	Devendra Nath Agrawal	.12.98 12.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
339.	Saeed-Uz-Zaman Siddiqui	12.98 7.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	12.98	
340.	Aditya Nath Mittal	.12.98 7.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
341.	Smt. Indra Ashish	14.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	14.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
342.	Naresh Chand Dubey	.12.98 14.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 30.11.2004
343.	Pramod Kumar Agrawal-II	.12.98 11.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
344.	Sher Bahadur Singh	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	

345.	Radhey Shyam Yadav-I	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
346.	Gopal Krishna Chaturvedi	.12.98 13.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
347.	Ashok Kumar Agrawal-II	13.12.98 13.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.12.98	
348.	Satish Kumar-I	.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2004
349.	Vimla Prasad	14.12.98 10.6.96		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	14.12.98	
350.	Bankey Lal Misra	.12.98 24.1.97		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
351.	Jagdish Chandra Misra-II	.12.98 25.1.97		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
352.	Seth Shailendra Nath Tandon	18.12.98 24.1.97		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79	18.12.98	

				dated 21.10.94		
353.	Ramesh Chandra Gupta-III	.12.98 31.1.97		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
354.	Om Prakash Verma-II	.12.98 27.10.97		21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.12.98	
355.	Dhirendra Nath	.12.98 25.1.97		31.10.94 Retirement of Sri Dinesh Chandra	.12.98	Retired on 31.5.2004
356.	Syed Hasan	.12.98 28.1.97		31.10.94 Retirement of Sri Rajendra Nath	.12.98	Reverted to below rank on 17.1.2005
357.	Kanti Prasad Rajvanshi	.5.99 28.1.97		31.10.94 Retirement of Sri R.L. Soni		In the reserve vacancy of 5.12.98 Retired on 30.6.2006
358.	Janardan Kumar Goyal	.5.2005 25.10.97(22, 3)		28.11.94 Retirement of Sri Hare Ram pathak	5.12.98	Vacancy given of 5.12.98
359.	Bharat Prasad Vishwakarma	14.12.98 24.1.97		31.1.95 Retirement of Sri R.C. Chaturvedi	14.12.98	
360.	Rattan Lal	15.12.98 22.1.97		31.1.95 Retirement of Sri V.V.Singh	15.12.98	Opted Uttaranchal
361.	Gaur Chand	.12.98 20.1.97		31.1.95 Retirement of Sri C.B. Jayaswal	.12.98	
362.	Ram Shanker Verma-II	.12.98 29.10.97		9.2.95 Compulsory retirement of Sri K.C.Jain	.12.98	
363.	Tariq Manzoor Khan	.12.98 20.1.97		15.2.95 Voluntary retirement of Sri S.L .Adarsh	.12.98	

364.	Ram Nagina Rai	.12.98 25.1.97		24.2.95 Creation of 5 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge for C.B.I. Case at Meerut/Bareilly/Lucknow /Varanasi and Gorakhpur, under G.O. No. 3246/VII-Nya-2-94-332/(G)/91	.12.98	Retired on 31.7.2003
365.	Hari Shanker Dubey	.12.98 24.10.97		24.2.95 Creation of 5 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge for C.B.I. Case at Meerut/Bareilly/Lucknow/ Varanasi and Gorakhpur, under G.O. No. 3246/VII-Nya-2-94-332/(G)/91	.12.98	
366.	Anil Kumar Sharma	.12.98 28.10.97		24.2.95 Creation of 5 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge for C.B.I. Case at Meerut/Bareilly/ Lucknow/ Varanasi and Gorakhpur, under G.O. No. 3246/VII-Nya-2-94-332/(G)/91	.12.98	
367.	Shyam Kumar Gupta	.12.98 25.10.97		24.2.95 Creation of 5 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge for C.B.I. Case at Meerut/Bareilly/Lucknow/ Varanasi and Gorakhpur, under G.O. No. 3246/VII-Nya-2-94-332/(G)/91	.12.98	Died on 27.6.1999
368.	Hari Krishna Dubey	.12.98 25.10.97		24.2.95 Creation of 5 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge for C.B.I. Case at Meerut/Bareilly/Lucknow/ Varanasi and Gorakhpur, under G.O. No. 3246/VII-Nya-2-94-332/(G)/91	.12.98	
369.	Umesh Chandra-II	.12.98 27.10.97		28.2.95 Retirement of Sri R.N. Sircar	.12.98	
370.	Anurag Kumar	14.12.98 28.10.97		8.3.95 Compulsory retirement of Sri Keshari Nandan Singh	14.12.98	



371.	Hakim Ali Khan	.12.98 29.10.97		14.3.95 Compulsory retirement of Sri K.N. Misra	.12.98	
372.	Dinesh Chandra Awasthi	.12.98 27.10.97		15.3.95 Elevation to Bench of Sri N.S.Gupta	.12.98	
373.	Brijesh Kumar Srivastava-II	.12.98 29.10.97		15.3.95 Elevation to Bench of Sri B.K.sharma	.12.98	
374.	Subhash Chandra-II	.12.98 24.10.97		15.3.95 Elevation to Bench of Sri D.C. Srivastava	.12.98	
375.	Brij Raj Singh	.12.98 24.10.97		31.3.95 Retirement of Sri J.V.N. Jaiswal	.12.98	
376.	Ram Nath Singh	14.12.98 1.11.97		31.3.95 Retirement of Sri R.R.Jatav	14.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2002
377.	Chintamani	.12.98 27.10.97		29.5.95 Death of Sri R.S. Garg	.12.98	Died on 30.10.1999
378.	Rajendra Singh Rathi	.12.98 27.10.97		31.5.95 Death of Sri Rakesh Dutt	.12.98	Retired on 30.6.2004
379.	Ram Ratan Agarwal-II	.12.98 27.10.97		11.6.95 Death of Sri K.D. Vashistha	.12.98	Opted Uttranchal
380.	Jagdish Narain Sharma	15.12.98 28.10.97		17.6.95 Death of Sri G.S. Sinha	15.12.98	Retired on 29.2.2004
381.	Bharat Bhushan	.12.98 27.10.97		30.6.95 Retirement of Sri J.S.Dubey	.12.98	
382.	Mahipal Sirohi	.12.98 31.3.98		30.6.95 Retirement of Sri N.K.Narang	.12.98	Died on 2.7.2000
383.	Zaki Ullah Khan	.12.98 31.3.98		30.6.95 Retirement of Sri S.P.Agarwal	.12.98	
384.	Banarsi Lal Pandey	.12.98 31.3.98		30.6.95 Retirement of Sri Imtiaz Uddin	.12.98	Retired on 31.7.2005

385.	Triyugi Narayan	.12.98 31.3.98		19.7.95 Retirement of Sri G.S.Chaubey	.12.98	
386.	Surendra Kumar Srivastava	.12.98 4.4.98		19.7.95 Death of Sri N.J. Khan	.12.98	
387.	Chandra Kant Tyagi	.5.99 1.4.98		31.7.95 Retirement of Sri Krishna Kant Verma	.12.98	In the reserve vacancy of 5.12.98 Retired on 31.12.2005
388.	Om Prakash Goyal	.12.98 3.4.98		31.7.95 Retirement of Sri S.K.Garg	.12.98	
389.	Veer Singh Rana	.12.98 1.4.98		31.7.95 Retirement of Sri Krishna Nath Singh	.12.98	
390.	Rajendra Prasad-I (Paliwal)	.12.98 31.3.98		31.7.95 Retirement of Sri R.N. Awasthy	.12.98	Retired on 31.5.2001
391.	Vinod Kumar Singh-I	14.12.98		31.7.95 Retirement of Sri S.K.Misra	14.12.98	Died on 22.1.2005
392.	Sunil Kumar Gupta	11.12.98		19.9.95 Creation of 3 Courts/Posts of Distt. & Sess. Judge of Padrauna/Bhadohi & Mahoba under G.O.No. 2010/VII-Nya-2-104G/94 dated 19.9.95	11.12.98	
393.	Arun Kumar	16.12.98		19.9.95 Creation of 3 Courts/Posts of Distt. & Sess. Judge of Padrauna/Bhadohi & Mahoba under G.O.No. 2010/VII-Nya-2-104G/94 dated 19.9.95	16.12.98	
394.	Syed Amir Abbas Husaini	11.12.98		19.9.95 Creation of 3 Courts/Posts of Distt. & Sess. Judge of Padrauna/Bhadohi & Mahoba under G.O.No. 2010/VII-Nya-2-104G/94 dated 19.9.95	11.12.98	
395.	Smt. Pratibha Khanna	14.12.98		30.9.95 Retirement of Sri S.C. Srivastava	14.12.98	
396.	Akhtar Husain Khan	18.12.98		30.9.95	18.12.98	

				Retirement of Sri J.R. Misra		
397.	Radhey Shyam Kalra	.12.98		31.10.95 Compulsory retirement of Sri L.P.Misra	.12.98	
398.	Smt. Ranjana Pandey	14.12.98		31.12.95 Retirement of Sri A.B. Hajela	14.12.98	
399.	Lalta Prasad-I	12.12.98		1.1.96 Death of Sri Mohammad Farooq	12.12.98	
400.	Dileep Kumar	11.12.98		14.1.96 Compulsory retirement of Sri K.C. Lamba	11.12.98	
401.	Sawant Singh	17.12.98		18.1.96 Death of Sri Daya Ram-I	17.12.98	Retired on 31.5.2004
402.	Vijai Verma-I	11.12.98		31.1.96 Retirement of Sri P.S. Malhotra	11.12.98	
403.	Krishna Chand Jauhari	11.12.98		31.1.96 Retirement of Sri Jhamman Lal	11.12.98	Retired on 31.1.2005
404.	Devendra Kumar Saxena	14.12.98		31.1.96 Retirement of Sri R.C.S. Chauhan	14.12.98	
405.	Arun Kumar Srivastava-II	.6.2003 25.5.2000		31.1.96 Retirement of Sri Brahma Nand	5.12.98	Vacancy given of 5.12.98
406.	Ashok Kumar-III	14.12.98		8.2.96 Termination of Sri S.C. Shukla	14.12.98	Retired on 30.6.2005
407.	Narendra Prasad	14.12.98		22.3.96 Elevation to Bench of Sri J.C. Gupta	14.12.98	
408.	Bhagwat Prasad Mahaur	12.12.98		22.3.96 Elevation to Bench of Sri J.C. Misra	12.12.98	
409.	Satyendra Kumar Agarwal	14.12.98		22.3.96 Elevation to Bench of Sri S.N.Tewari	14.12.98	
410.	Km. Sudha Singh	14.12.98		8.4.96 Compulsory retirement of Sri R.C.Shukla-II	14.12.98	

411.	Yogendra Singh-I	20.5.2005 3.2005		30.4.96 Retirement of Sri R.K. Srivastava	20.5.2005	
412.	Dinesh Kumar Sharma-I	19.5.2005 .3.2005		30.6.96 Retirement of Sri M.N. Kulshrestha	19.5.2005	
413.	Gopal Singh Chandel	24.5.2005 10.2.1999		12.7.96 Death of Sri S.B. Lal	24.5.2005	
414.	Ram Kumar Gupta	17.5.2005 16.2.1999		14.7.96 Compulsory retirement of Sri Parmeshwar	17.5.2005	
415.	Dina Nath Srivastava	26.5.2005 18.2.1999		15.7.96 Compulsory retirement of Sri Narendra Singh	26.5.2005	
416.	Anil Kumar Srivastava-I	19.5.2005 13.2.1999		31.7.96 Voluntary retirement of Sri M.P.Singh-I	19.5.2005	Retired on 31.12.2005
417.	Rahul Misra	20.5.2005 25.5.1999		31.7.96 Retirement of K.C. Agarwal	20.5.2005	
418.	Surendra Kumar Singh Yadav	25.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.8.96 Creation of 2 Courts/Posts of Distt. Sess. Judge Ambedkar Nagar & Udham Singh Nagar under G.O. No. 600/VII-Nya-2-157G/95 dated 12.8.96	25.5.2005	
419.	Dinesh Kumar Gupta	24.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.8.96 Creation of 2 Courts/Posts of Distt. Sess. Judge Ambedkar Nagar & Udham Singh Nagar under G.O. No. 600/VII-Nya-2-157G/95 dated 12.8.96	24.5.2005	
420.	Yash Pal Sharma	6.6.2005 12.2.1999		16.9.96 Death of Sri S.K.Saxena	6.6.2005	Retired on 31.1.2006
421.	Alok Kumar Bose	26.5.2005 16.2.1999		30.9.96 Retirement of Sri Shree Pal	26.5.2005	
422.	Jitendra Nath Sinha	20.5.2005 16.2.1999		31.10.96 Retirement of Sri D.P.Singh	20.5.2005	
423.	Arun Kumar Singh	4.6.2005 17.2.1999		5.11.96 Creation of 2 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	4.6.2005	

				Judges for Dehradun and Natnital, under G.O.No 1585/VII-Nya-2-266/96		
424.	Yogesh Kumar	.5.2005 19.2.1999		5.11.96 Creation of 2 Courts/Posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges for Dehradun and Natnital, under G.O.No 1585/VII-Nya-2-266/96	.5.2005	
425.	Jagdish Kumar Sant	21.5.2005 15.2.1999		10.11.96 Death of Sri J.B. Singh-II	21.5.2005	
426.	Kamal Singh	.5.2005 16.2.1999		19.11.96 Elevation to Bench of Sri P.K. Jain	.5.2005	
427.	Chaturbhuj	18.5.2005 17.2.1999		19.11.96 Elevation to Bench of Sri Bhagwan Din	18.5.2005	
428.	Ram Singh-II	26.5.2005 24.2.1999		19.11.96 Compulsory retirement of Sri K.K.Singh	26.5.2005	Retired on 31.12.2005
429.	Shailendra Dutt Paliwal	21.5.2005 14.2.1999		30.11.96 Retirement of Sri K.P.Singh	21.5.2005	
430.	Hira Lal-II	21.5.2005 18.2.1999		2.1.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri Mohan Lal	21.5.2005	
431.	Ram Autar Kaushik	.5.2005 12.2.1999		3.2.97 Elevation to Bench of Sri M.L.Singhal	.5.2005	
432.	Pratap Virendra Kushwaha	19.5.2005 16.2.1999		3.2.97 Elevation to Bench of Sri K.D. Sahi	19.5.2005	
433.	Rajendra Kumar-I	21.5.2005 17.2.1999		3.2.97 Elevation to Bench of Sri O.P.Garg	21.5.2005	
434.	Har Pal Singh	.5.2005 12.2.1999		3.2.97 Elevation to Bench of Sri DK. Trivedi	.5.2005	
435.	Smt. Rama Jain	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		3.2.97 Elevation to Bench of Sri R.P.Nigam	19.5.2005	
436.	Ambrish Kumar	.5.2005 19.2.1999		14.2.97 Voluntary retirement of Praduman Kumar	.5.2005	

437.	Subhash Chandra-III	19.5.2005 16.2.1999		20.3.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri S.R.Singh	19.5.2005	
438.	Balendu Singh	.5.2005 16.2.1999		31.3.97 Retirement of Sri Satya Narain Pandey	.5.2005	
439.	Mahesh Chandra Sharma	.5.2005 12.2.1999		7.4.97 Voluntary retirement of Sri V.K. Sircar	.5.2005	
440.	Niwas Prasad	3.6.2005 16.2.1999		7.4.97 Retirement of Sri R.S.Nigam	3.6.2005	
441.	Shashi Kant Pandey	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		15.5.97 Voluntary retirement of Sri S.K.Gupta	18.5.2005	
442.	Mool Chand (Shukla)	24.5.2005 12.2.1999		9.6.97 Voluntary retirement of Sri R.P.Pandey-I	24.5.2005	
443.	Deepak Kumar	19.5.2005 15.2.1999		30.6.97 Retirement of Sri S.C. Tewari	19.5.2005	
444.	Ashok Kumar Tripathi	21.5.2005 13.2.1999		30.6.97 Retirement of Sri N.S. Gahlot	21.5.2005	
445.	Harsu Dayal Srivastava	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		7.7.97 Voluntary retirement of Sri R.L.Ojha	19.5.2005	
446.	Om Prakash Sinha	21.5.2005 16.2.1999		25.7.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri Munendra Kumar	21.5.2005	
447.	Raj Vir Sharma	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		14.8.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri V.B.Srivastava	18.5.2005	
448.	Jagdishwar Singh	21.5.2005 12.2.1999		23.8.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri Jagdish Singh	21.5.2005	
449.	Pramod Kumar Goel	18.5.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under	18.5.2005	

				G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97		
450.	Brijesh Kumar Srivastava-III	21.5.2005 .3.2005		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	21.5.2005	
451.	Virendra Kumar Tyagi	21.5.2005 20.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	21.5.2005	
452.	Ravindra Bahadur Rai	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	18.5.2005	
453.	Udai Shanker Awasthi	18.5.2005 11.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	18.5.2005	
454.	Rakesh Kumar-I	18.5.2005 13.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	18.5.2005	
455.	Surendra Vikram Singh	20.5.2005		8.9.97	20.5.2005	

		3.2.2005		Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97		
456.	Gyan Chandra	17.5.2005 11.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	17.5.2005	
457.	Ashok Kumar Rastogi-II	24.5.2005 19.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	24.5.2005	
458.	Shamsher Bahadur Singh	19.5.2005 18.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	19.5.2005	
459.	Gopal Narain Sinha	26.5.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	26.5.2005	
460.	Ashwani Kumar	18.5.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	18.5.2005	
461.	Ahmad Naseem	21.5.2005 13.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges	21.5.2005	



				pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97		
462.	Vinod Kumar Misra	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	18.5.2005	
463.	Amar Nath Upadhyaya	.5.2005 11.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	.5.2005	
464.	Gopal Shanker Pathak	21.5.2005 12.2.99		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	21.5.2005	
465.	Brijesh Chandra Saxena	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	19.5.2005	
466.	Amar Singh	2.6.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	2.6.2005	
467.	Dinesh Kumar (Srivastava)	.5.2005 12.2.1999		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P.,under	.5.2005	

				G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97		
468.	Pramod Kumar Srivastava-I	21.5.2005 25.1.2000		8.9.97 Creation of 20 Courts/Posts of Special Judges pertaining to trial of SC/ST cases in U.P., under G.O.No.U.O./29/VII-Nya-9(Budget)-97-4(SND)/97 samaj kalyan anubhag-3 dated 8.9.97	21.5.2005	
469.	Jai Jai Ram Pandey	17.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	17.5.2005	
470.	Riaz Haider Zaidi	21.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	21.5.2005	
471.	Shyam Vinod	21.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	21.5.2005	
472.	Raghvendra Kumar	20.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
473.	Subodh Chand Verma	20.5.2005 .2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
474.	Rajendra Kumar Jain	25.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	25.5.2005	

				Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97		
475.	Abhai Kumar Gupta	25.5.2005 15.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	25.5.2005	
476.	4 Shashank Shekhar	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
477.	4 Dileep Singh	19.5.2005 .3.2005		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
478.	Sukh Lal	20.5.2005 13.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
479.	4 Ratan Lal Dhar	.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	.5.2005	
480.	4 Ajai Verma	1.6.2005 19.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	1.6.2005	
481	Satish Chand Singh	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
482	Ram Raj Tewari	.5.2005		12.9.97	.5.2005	

		10.2.1999		Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97		
483	Prakash Chand Misra	24.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	24.5.2005	
484	Om Prakash Dixit	26.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	26.5.2005	
485	Shubhendra Kumar	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
486	Syed Nazar Abbas Zaidi	18.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
487	Krishna Murari Lal Srivastava	.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	.5.2005	
488.	Lal Bahadur Singh-I	24.5.2005 19.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	24.5.2005	
489.	Pratyush Kumar	18.5.2005 17.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	18.5.2005	

				Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97		
490.	Riyasat Husain	19.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
491.	Ram Prakash-I	20.5.2005 18.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
492.	Nihal Ahmad Siddiqui	18.5.2005 13.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
493.	Km. Sudha Sharma	19.5.2005 19.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
494.	Rajendra Prasad Sharma	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
495.	Krishna Pal Singh-I	18.5.2005 16.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
496.	Sukh Pal Singh	20.5.2005 12.2.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	Retired on 31.1.2006

497.	Raja Ram Yadav	28.5.2005 27.5.2000		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	28.5.2005	
498.	Brijesh Kumar Nigam	20.5.2005 26.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
499.	Abhai Kumar	3.6.2005 25.5.2000		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	3.6.2005	
500.	Roop Kishore Gupta	18.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
501.	Pawan Kumar Jain	19.5.2005 22.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
502.	Divendra Kumar Tewari	19.5.2005 26.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
503.	Jishnu Kant	24.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	24.5.2005	
504.	Shakti Kant	18.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79	18.5.2005	

				dated 12.9.97		
505.	Prem Singh-II	.5.2005 25.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	.5.2005	
506.	Shiva Prakash Misra	20.5.2005 .1.2000		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
507.	Kishore Kumar-I	21.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	21.5.2005	
508.	Vijai Pratap Singh-II	20.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
509.	Om Prakash Tiwari	26.5.2005 25.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	26.5.2005	
510.	Vijai Kumar Khatri	19.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
511.	Rajiv Kumar Tripathi	19.5.2005 24.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
512.	Ram Chandra Misra-I	24.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	24.5.2005	

				Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97		
513.	Alok Kumar Mukherjee	18.5.2005 22.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	18.5.2005	
514.	Gyan Prakash (Shukla)-I	21.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	21.5.2005	
515.	Balvir Prasad	20.5.2005 24.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	20.5.2005	
516.	Naresh Jain	31.5.2005 23.6.1999		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	31.5.2005	
517.	Girish Mohan Mittal	26.5.2005 27.5.2000		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	26.5.2005	
518.	Kushal Pal Singh	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		12.9.97 Creation of 50 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judge, under G.O. No. 3631/VII-Nya-2-97-217/79 dated 12.9.97	19.5.2005	
519.	Ranjit Singh Yadav-II	.5.2005 29.5.2000		23.10.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri Munni Lal	.5.2005	



520.	Mohd. Adil	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	19.5.2005	
521.	Lakshmi Shanker Sahu	21.5.2005 23.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	21.5.2005	
522.	Sagwa Singh	18.5.2005 27.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	18.5.2005	
523.	Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi	25.5.2005 24.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	25.5.2005	
524.	Radhey Shyam Singh	27.5.2005 29.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji	27.5.2005	

				Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97		
525.	Jai Prakash-I	30.5.2005 27.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	30.5.2005	
526.	Diwakar Singh Katiyar	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	19.5.2005	
527.	Surendra Prakash Singh	21.5.2005 26.5.2000		19.12.97 Creation of 8 courts/posts of officer on Special Duty, in 8 new Districts viz. Mahamaya Nagar, Jyotiba-Phule Nagar, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Nagar Chandauli Shrawasti, Kaushambi & Balrampur under, G.O.No. 4661/VII-Nya-2-114G/97 dated 19.12.97	21.5.2005	
528.	Babu Lal Yadav	27.5.2005 25.5.2000		31.12.97 Compulsory retirement of Sri Sarnam Singh	27.5.2005	
529.	Raghubar Dayal	6.6.2005 27.5.2000		31.12.97 Retirement of Sri S.B. Balveer	6.6.2005	
530.	Lal Bahadur Singh-II	2.6.2005 27.5.2000		2.1.98 Compulsory retirement of Sri C.P. Singh	2.6.2005	
531.	Avani Kumar Upadhyaya	.5.2005 25.5.2000		31.1.98 Retirement of Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh	.5.2005	
532.	Dhani Ram Sonker	21.5.2005		31.3.98	21.5.2005	

		25.5.2000		Retirement of Sri S.N.Singh		
533.	Vigyan Ram Misra	24.5.2005 25.5.2000		6.5.98 Removal of Sri Jagdish-I	24.5.2005	
534.	Indra Jeet Verma	20.5.2005 29.5.2000		7.5.98 Compulsory Retirement of Sri G.S.Nema	20.5.2005	
535.	Sudhir Chandra Srivastava	18.5.2005 25.5.2000		31.5.98 Voluntary Retirement of Sri MaheshChand-II	18.5.2005	
536.	Hira Lal Kardam	28.5.2005 30.5.2000		25.6.98 Creation of 3 courts/ posts of Kannauj, Auraiya, Sant Kabir Nagar vide G.O.No.2166/VII-Nyay-2-36/98 dated 25.6.98	28.5.2005	
537.	Narendra Singh Raval	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		25.6.98 Creation of 3 courts/ posts of Kannauj, Auraiya, Sant Kabir Nagar vide G.O.No.2166/VII-Nyay-2-36/98 dated 25.6.98	19.5.2005	
538.	Ashok Kumar Jain	25.5.2005 24.5.2000		9.7.98 Compulsory Retirement of Sri Radha Krishna Gupta	25.5.2005	
539.	Ishwar Dayal	.5.2005 29.5.2000		31.7.98 Retirement of Sri C.P.Singh	.5.2005	
540.	Brahma Deo Misra	19.5.2005 24.5.2000		31.7.98 Retirement of Sri B.G.Saxena	19.5.2005	
541.	Sheo Ram	.5.2005 26.5.2000		1.9.98 Creation of 4 courts/ posts of Champawat, Bageshwar Baghpat, Rudraprayag vide G.O.No. 3662/VII-Nyay-2-98-3G/98 dated 1.9.98	.5.2005	
542.	Jagdish Prasad-III	.5.2005 24.5.2000		1.9.98 Creation of 4 courts/ posts of Champawat, Bageshwar Baghpat, Rudraprayag vide G.O.No. 3662/VII-Nyay-2-98-3G/98 dated 1.9.98	.5.2005	

543.	Dinesh Kumar Shukla	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
544.	Ram Bhajan Lal	18.5.2005 26.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	18.5.2005	
545.	Krishnashish Bhattacharya	.5.2005 25.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	.5.2005	
546.	Dina Nath-I	19.5.2005 27.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
547.	Narayan Singh-II	.5.2005 26.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	.5.2005	
548.	Rajendra Prasad-II	24.5.2005 30.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	24.5.2005	Retired on 31.10.2005
549.	Daljinder Pal Singh	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
550.	Dr. Ram Hit Prasad	19.5.2005 25.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated	19.5.2005	

				3.9.98		
551.	Hitla Prasad Chaudhary	20.5.2005 26.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	20.5.2005	Retired on 31.1.2006
552.	Gyanendra Singh	20.5.2005 25.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	20.5.2005	
553.	Sadho Ram	19.5.2005 30.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
554.	Pradeep Kumar-I	19.5.2005 24.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
555.	Padam Nath Chaturvedi	19.5.2005 29.5.2000		3.9.98 Creation of 25 courts of ADJ for speedy disposal vide G.O.No. 1328/VII-Nyaya-2-98-217/97 dated 3.9.98	19.5.2005	
556.	Shiladitya Singh	24.5.2005 26.5.2000		16.1.99 Dismissal of Sri Ram Naresh Ram	24.5.2005	
557.	Shanker Prasad Srivastava	.5.2005 30.5.2000		31.1.99 Retirement of Sri Udai Chand	.5.2005	
558.	Shambhoo Saran Gupta	6.6.2005 29.5.2000		31.1.99 Retirement of Sri Jawahar Lal Kaul	6.6.2005	
559.	Anil Kumar Srivastava-II	18.5.2005 25.5.2000		31.1.99 Retirement of Sri C.M.Dungrakoti	18.5.2005	
560.	Hari Nath Prasad Agarwal	19.5.2005 27.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Laxmi Behari	19.5.2005	

561.	Suresh Chand Jain	13.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Ikramul Bari	13.5.2005	
562.	Bhanu Nandan Misra	21.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Mahesh Chandra Jain	21.5.2005	
563.	Jagendra Singh	.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Kamal Kishore	.5.2005	
564.	Tarkeshwar Nath Pandey	21.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Bhupendra Kumar Rathi	21.5.2005	
565.	Ravindra Bhashkar	28.5.2005 25.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Ravindra Dayal Mathur	28.5.2005	
566.	Ravindra Nath Kakkar	21.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Satish Kumar Jain	21.5.2005	
567.	Dr. Murtaza Ali	21.5.2005 26.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Uma Shanker Tripathi	21.5.2005	
568.	Ram Pratap Misra	19.5.2005 24.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Naseem Uddin	19.5.2005	
569.	Ram Pal Singh-I	21.5.2005 27.5.2000		5.2.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Ramesh Dutt Shukla	21.5.2005	
570.	Subhash Chandra-IV	.5.2005 27.5.2000		11.2.99 Compulsory Retirement of Sri Naval Singh	.5.2005	
571.	Ashok Kumar Tewari	.5.2005 30.5.2000		28.2.99 Compulsory retirement of Sri Hori Lal Kureel	.5.2005	
572.	Ashok Kumar-IV	27.5.2005 27.5.2000		26.3.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Krishna Kumar-I	27.5.2005	
573.	Ram Naresh Misra	1.6.2005 26.5.2000		26.3.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Khem Karan	1.6.2005	
574.	Smt. Vijai Laxmi	.5.2005 24.5.2000		26.3.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Bhanwar Singh	.5.2005	
575.	Yash Pal Singh	20.5.2005 29.5.2000		26.3.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Mohd. Asgar Khan	20.5.2005	

576.	Umesh Chandra Srivastava	18.5.2005 24.3.2001		26.3.99 Elevation to Bench of Sri Onkareshwar Bhatt	18.5.2005	
577.	Kailashendra Prasad	21.5.2005 24.3.2001		31.3.99 Retirement of Sri S.S.Gupta	21.5.2005	
578.	Rakesh Kumar-II	18.5.2005 27.3.2001		31.3.99 Retirement of Sri Raghunath Singh	18.5.2005	
579.	Shambhoo Saran Misra	.5.2005 24.3.2001		24.4.99 Death of Sri R.M.Rai	.5.2005	
580.	Hirday Sagar	20.5.2005 .3.2005		30.4.99 Retirement of Sri Jagdish Chandra-III	20.5.2005	
581.	Raj Bahadur Singh-I	21.5.2005 24.3.2001		30.4.99 Retirement of Sri S.P.Tyagi	21.5.2005	
582.	Ashok Kumar-V	19.5.2005 26.3.2001		30.4.99 Retirement of Sri Babu Singh Rajput	19.5.2005	
583.	Ravindra Nath Mishra-II	28.5.2005 26.3.2001		30.4.99 Retirement of Sri Siddharth Muni Goel	28.5.2005	
584.	Vimal Chandra	4.6.2005 24.3.2001		30.4.99 Retirement of Sri Mohd. Abid	4.6.2005	
585.	Janardan Singh	.5.2005 .3.2005		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	.5.2005	
586.	Prabhat Chandra Tripathi	18.5.2005 26.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	18.5.2005	
587.	Tejvir Singh	2.6.2005 11.5.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide	2.6.2005	

				G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99		
588.	Sharda Prasad Tewari	19.5.2005 27.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	
589.	Mohammad Babar	.5.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	.5.2005	
590.	Udit Narain Singh	18.5.2005 27.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	18.5.2005	
591.	Vijai Kumar	21.5.2005 29.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	21.5.2005	
592.	Arun Prakash	19.5.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	
593.	Vinod Kumar Srivastava-III	18.5.2005 30.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	18.5.2005	
594.	Chintamani Tewari	24.5.2005 .3.2005		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	24.5.2005	
595.	Vindhyachal Prasad Srivastava	21.5.2005		5.5.99	21.5.2005	



		29.3.2001		Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99		
596.	Shiv Sharma	19.5.2005 31.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	
597.	Brij Bhushan Pandey	.5.2005 26.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	.5.2005	
598.	Shyam Sunder	19.5.2005 26.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	
599.	Ramesh Kumar Tripathi	24.5.2005 27.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	24.5.2005	
600.	Chheda Lal Verma	20.5.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	20.5.2005	
601.	Prem Prakash Tewari	21.5.2005 26.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	21.5.2005	
602.	Deepak Kumar Srivastava-I	21.5.2005 30.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	21.5.2005	

603.	Shyam Behari Pandey	20.6.2005 27.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	20.6.2005	
604.	Rama Adhar Singh Yadav	19.5.2005 26.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	Retired on 31.7.2005
605.	Ram Prakash Verma	18.5.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	18.5.2005	
606.	Ram Charan Chaudhary	2.6.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	2.6.2005	
607.	Rajan Singh Sachan	27.5.2005 24.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	27.5.2005	
608.	Laxmi Narain	19.5.2005 .3.2005		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	19.5.2005	
609.	Mahendra Pratap Yadav	.5.2005 27.3.2001		5.5.99 Creation of 25 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.U.O.O 3/ VII-Nyay-9(Budget)/99-217/79 dated 5.5.99	.5.2005	
610.	Prem Narain Sachan	19.5.2005 26.3.2001		31.5.99 Retirement of Sri Badri Niwas	19.5.2005	
611.	Mohammad Iqbal	.5.2005		31.5.99	.5.2005	

		28.5.2001		Retirement of Sri Tahir Ali		
612.	Het Ram	.5.2005 30.6.2001		27.6.99 Death of Sri S.K.Gupta	.5.2005	
613.	Shafiq Uddin	2.6.2005 17.5.2001		31.7.99 Retirement of Sri Duli Chand	2.6.2005	
614.	Liaqat Ali-I	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.7.99 Retirement of Sri V.P.Govil	19.5.2005	
615.	Amar Jeet Singh	.5.2005 28.5.2001		31.7.99 Retirement of Sri R.V.Singh-II	.5.2005	
616.	Mata Amber Singh	20.5.2005 26.5.2001		31.7.99 Retirement of Sri Khem Singh	20.5.2005	
617.	Hira Lal Verma	26.5.2005 28.5.2001		3.8.99 Voluntary retirement of Sri S.K.I.Naqvi	26.5.2005	
618.	Ram Chandra-II	.5.2005 22.5.2001		4.8.99 Voluntary retirement of Sri Rafiquddin	.5.2005	
619.	Ram Kunwar	21.5.2005 29.5.2001		31.8.99 Retirement of Sri N.K.Jain	21.5.2005	
620.	Lal Bahadur Ram	31.5.2005 26.5.2001		30.9.99 Retirement of Sri UttamSingh Pangti	31.5.2005	
621.	Har Nath Singh Sengar	18.5.2005 15.5.2001		30.9.99 Retirement of Sri S.K.S.Sengar	18.5.2005	
622.	Prem Chandra	.5.2005 .3.2005		11.10.99 Death of Sri Babar Husain	.5.2005	
623.	Anand Kumar Upadhyay	.5.2005 16.5.2001		30.10.99 Death of Sri Chintamani	.5.2005	
624.	Ashok Kumar Singh-I	21.5.2005 17.5.2001		31.10.99 Retirement of Sri Mahesh Chand-I	21.5.2005	Died on 27.2.2006
625.	Prem Bahadur	24.5.2005 17.5.2001		30.11.99 Retirement of Sri Jitendra Singh-I	24.5.2005	
626.	Lal Chandra Tripathi	19.5.2005		31.12.99	19.5.2005	

		28.5.2001		Retirement of Sri Kartar Singh		
627.	Alakh Narain	19.5.2005 28.5.2001		31.12.99 Retirement of Sri Ram Sagar Verma-I	19.5.2005	
628.	Jagan Nath Kardam	21.5.2005 19.5.2001		5.1.2000 Death of Sri Satish Chandra Agarwal	21.5.2005	
629.	Sheo Yatna Ram	21.5.2005 .3.2005		31.1.2000 Retirement of Sri Har Charan	21.5.2005	
630.	Hukum Singh-III	26.5.2005 .3.2005		1.2.2000 Removed from Service Sri S.K.Malviya	26.5.2005	
631.	Bhudeo Singh	21.5.2005 .3.2005		3.2.2000 Death of Sri B.M.Joshi	21.5.2005	Retired on 31.7.2005
632.	Daya Shanker Tripathi	18.5.2005 3.3.2005		21.2.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri S.P.Lal	18.5.2005	
633.	Ramesh Chandra Misra-II	19.5.2005 .3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	19.5.2005	
634.	Dr. Naresh Kumar Bahl	27.5.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	27.5.2005	
635.	Sheo Kumar Singh-I	18.5.2005 .3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	18.5.2005	
636.	Pramod Kumar Misra	24.5.2005 .3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	24.5.2005	
637.	Mohammad Razi Khan	19.5.2005 .3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8	19.5.2005	

				Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96		
638.	Mumtaz Ali	20.5.2005 2.3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	20.5.2005	
639.	Shyam Lal-I	19.5.2005 .3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	19.5.2005	
640.	Ram Mohan Sharma	.5.2005 3.3.2005		26.2.2000 Creation of 8 courts/posts of ADJ vide G.O.No.8 Bha- Sa/Saat-Nyay-2(Uchchya Nyayalaya)/ 200/159G/96	.5.2005	
641.	Virendra Kumar-II	19.5.2005 .3.2005		3.3.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri R.K.Dubey	19.5.2005	
642.	Shiv Shanker Lal	21.5.2005 .3.2005		16.3.2000 Reversion of Smt. Sushma Kumari Solanki in the cadre of Civil Judge, Sr.Div. Vide Govt. Notification No.198/II-42000-26/2(3)/2000 dated 16.3.2000	21.5.2005	
643.	Umesh Chandra Pandey	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.3.2000 Retirement of Sri Yashwant Singh	19.5.2005	
644.	Shailendra Kumar Agrawal	19.5.2005 2.3.2005		31.3.2000 Retirement of Sri R.K.Kulshrestha	19.5.2005	
645.	Vinod Kumar Yadav	19.5.2005 .3.2005		5.4.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri Aquil Uddin Khan	19.5.2005	
646.	Raj Kumar -II	21.5.2005 2.3.2005		13.4.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri M.S.Premi	21.5.2005	
647.	Pradeep Kumar-II	18.5.2005 .3.2005		27.4.2000 Death of Sri O.P.Bansal	18.5.2005	

648.	Brijendra Mohan Sinha	20.5.2005 .3.2005		8.5.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri Gangoo Ram	20.5.2005	
649.	Sanjay Harkauli	19.5.2005 2.3.2005		31.5.2000 Retirement of Sri S.P.Singh	19.5.2005	
650.	Akhil Kumar Upadhyaya	19.5.2005 .3.2005		2.7..2000 Death of Sri Mahi Pal Singh Sirohi	19.5.2005	
651.	Om Prakash Agarwal	20.5.2005 .3.2005		4.7.2000 Compulsory retirement of Sri Fahim Ahmad Khan	20.5.2005	
652.	Gokulesh	.5.2005 3.3.2005		31.7.2000 Death of Sri Pancham Ram	.5.2005	
653.	Krishna Pratap Singh	18.5.2005 4.3.2005		31.7.2000 Retirement of Sri M.Q.Siddiqui	18.5.2005	
654.	Smt. Rekha Dikshit	18.5.2005 2.3.2005		31.7.2000 Retirement of Sri Som Dutt(Arora)	18.5.2005	
655.	Musharraf Hussain	25.5.2005 .3.2005		31.7.2000 Retirement of Sri C.P.S.Sisodia	25.5.2005	
656.	Sukhbeer Singh Rana	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.7.2000 Retirement of Sri R.C.Nigam	19.5.2005	
657.	Arun Kumar Gupta	24.5.2005 3.3.2005		31.7.2000 Retirement of Sri S.P.Srivastava	24.5.2005	
658.	Brijesh Kumar	20.5.2005 .3.2005		1.8.2000 Voluntary retirement of Sri Ziley Singh	20.5.2005	
659.	Satya Narain Agnihotri	18.5.2005 5.3.2005		21/22.8.2000 Death of Sri J.C.Misra-II	18.5.2005	
660.	Narendra Kumar Garg	2.6.2005 .3.2005		31.8.2000 Retirement of Sri K.K.Yadav	2.6.2005	
661.	Rajan Chaudhary	18.5.2005 .3.2005		31.8.2000 Retirement of Sri Chandra Bhan-I	18.5.2005	
662.	Shiv Nath	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.12.2000 Retirement of Sri D.K.Jain	19.5.2005	

663.	Jai Prakash –II	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.12.2000 Retirement of Sri Radhey Shyam Pandey	19.5.2005	
664.	Smt. Sushila (Singh)	12.5.2005 5.3.2005		31.12.2000 Retirement of Sri Mahabir Saran Nigam	12.5.2005	
665.	Ram Chandra-III (Suman)	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.12.2000 Retirement of Sri Krishna Kumar -III	19.5.2005	
666.	Keshav Prasad Tripathi	21.5.2005 .3.2005		31.1.2001 Retirement of Sri V.K.Jain	21.5.2005	
667.	Chandra Sen Kureel	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.1.2001 Retirement of Sri Y.S.Sengar	19.5.2005	
668.	Satan Lal Rajvanshi	20.5.2005 3.3.2005		31.1.2001 Retirement of Sri Ram Dawar Singh	20.5.2005	
669.	Suresh Chandra Garg	24.5.2005 .3.2005		28.2.2001 Retirement of Sri B.D.S.Srivastava	24.5.2005	Retired on 31.7.2005
670.	Devendra Kumar Nailwal	19.5.2005		28.2.2001 Retirement of Sri M.P.S.Tejan	19.5.2005	
671.	Chandra Mohan Dixit	20.5.2005 2.3.2005		28.2.2001 Retirement of Sri Vinod Kumar Bishnoi	20.5.2005	
672.	Akhilesh Chandra Sharma	19.5.2005 3.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
673.	Shyam Lal-II	.5.2005 3.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	.5.2005	
674.	Ram Kishna Gautam	18.5.2005 5.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases	18.5.2005	

				relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001		
675.	Jaisheel Pathak	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
676.	Om Prakash-V	21.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	21.5.2005	
677.	Ramesh Tewari	.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	.5.2005	
678.	Devendra Nath Shukla	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
679.	Krishna Singh	21.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	21.5.2005	
680.	Sri Prakash	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
681.	Rajiv Lochan Mehrotra	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
682.	Mahboob Ali	19.5.2005		29.3.2001	19.5.2005	



		.3.2005		Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001		
683.	Rang Nath Pandey	21.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	21.5.2005	
684.	Subhash Chandra-V	21.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	21.5.2005	
685.	Umesh Kumar	19.5.2005 1.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
686.	Anirudh Singh	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
687.	Syed Mohammad Haseeb	19.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
688.	Dinesh Kumar Singh-I	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
689.	Shamshad Ahmad	26.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	26.5.2005	

690.	Masaud Ali Siddiqui	22.5.2005 1.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	22.5.2005	
691.	Onkar Singh	.5.2005 .3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 20 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to SC/ST Act. Vide G.O. No.449/VII-Nyay-22001-124/89 dated 29.3.2001	.5.2005	
692.	Razi Ahmad	19.5.2005 .3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
693.	Luqmanul Haq	19.5.2005 2.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
694.	Ramesh Chandra-III	20.5.2005 3.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	20.5.2005	
695.	Ashok Kumar Saxena	18.5.2005 2.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	18.5.2005	
696.	Devendra Kumar Misra	19.5.2005 2.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
697.	Ifaqt Ali Khan	18.5.2005 2.3.2005	29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-	18.5.2005	

				Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001		
698.	Ashok Kumar Pathak	18.5.2005 1.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	18.5.2005	
699.	Ashok Kumar Singh-II	.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	.5.2005	
700.	Rajendra Singh-I	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
701.	Deepak Kumar Srivastava-II	19.5.2005 5.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
702.	Vijay Kumar Sharma	19.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
703.	Dharam Vijay Singh	21.5.2005 3.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	21.5.2005	Compulsary Retired on 8.6.2006
704.	Umesh Chandra Tripathi	18.5.2005 3.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	18.5.2005	
705.	Umesh Chandra Saxena-II	20.5.2005 2.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases	20.5.2005	

				relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001		
706.	Pradeep Chaudhary	19.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	19.5.2005	
707.	Prasoon Kumar Katiyar	20.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	20.5.2005	
708.	Guru Saran Srivastava	20.5.2005 1.3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	20.5.2005	
709.	Indrish Kumar	25.5.2005 .3.2005		29.3.2001 Creation of 18 courts/posts of ADJ for trying cases relating to N.D.P.S. Act. Vide G.O. No.448/VII-Nyay-2(A.N.)-159-G-96 dated 29.3.2001	25.5.2005	
710.	Subhash Chandra Kulshrestha	19.5.2005 .3.2005		31.3.2001 Retirement of Sri S.C.Ravi	19.5.2005	
711.	Ramashraya Singh	18.5.2005 .3.2005		31.3.2001 Retirement of Sri NanakChand	18.5.2005	
712.	Dilip Kumar Srivastava	31.5.2005 2.3.2005		31.3.2001 Retirement of Sri H.S.Sharma	31.5.2005	
713.	Chandra Has Ram	24.5.2005 .3.2005		31.3.2001 Retirement of Sri P.D.Dhaundiyaal	24.5.2005	
714.	Bhagwan Deo Misra	24.5.2005 2.3.2005		31.3.2001 Voluntary retirement of Sri Vinod Kumar Jain-II	24.5.2005	
715.	Saleem Ahmad Khan	19.5.2005 3.3.2005		31.3.2001 Voluntary retirement of Sri Zameer Uddin	19.5.2005	

716.	Nasir Ahmad-I	20.5.2005 .3.2005		30.4.2001 Retirement of Sri Om Prakash Dwivedi	20.5.2005	
717.	Liaqat Ali-II	20.5.2005 .3.2005		30.5.2001 Retirement of Sri Rajendra Prasad-I	20.5.2005	
718.	Tej Singh Rana	19.5.2005 3.3.2005		30.6.2001 Retirement of Sri V.N.Pandey	19.5.2005	
719.	Arun Kumar Tripahi	19.5.2005 4.3.2005		30.6.2001 Retirement of Sri V.N.Chaddha	19.5.2005	
720.	Shyam Raj	4.5.2005 3.3.2005		30.6.2001 Retirement of Sri A.S.Chaudhary	4.5.2005	
721.	Jai Pal Singh-II	.5.2005 3.3.2005		30.6.2001 Retirement of Sri G.S.Shukla	.5.2005	
722.	Mahendra Singh-I	24.5.2005 3.3.2005		30.6.2001 Retirement of Sri Neyaz Ahmad-II	24.5.2005	
723.	Uma Shanker Pasi	19.5.2005 .3.2005		6.7.2001 Death of Sri Shital Singh	19.5.2005	
724.	Rajendra Singh-II	19.5.2005 1.3.2005		31.7.2001 Retirement of Sri Brahma Singh	19.5.2005	
725.	Ram Nebul Saroj	27.5.2005 .3.2005		31.7.2001 Retirement of Sri Lekha Singh	27.5.2005	
726.	Rajendra Kumar-II	20.5.2005 5.3.2005		31.7.2001 Retirement of Sri S.P.Misra	20.5.2005	
727.	Tufani Prasad	20.5.2005 .3.2005		31.7.2001 Retirement of Sri Rameshwar Singh	20.5.2005	
728.	Raja Ram Saroj	.5.2005 5.3.2005		31.7.2001 Retirement of Sri Krishna Kumar-II	.5.2005	
729.	Kailash Babu	21.5.2005 3.3.2005		30.9.2001 Retirement of Sri Muhi-UI-Islam	21.5.2005	
730.	Deo Kant Tyagi	.5.2005 .3.2005		30.9.2001 Retirement of Sri Veer Bhadra Singh	.5.2005	

731.	Sri Vimal Prakash Kandpal		18.7.2005	27.4.94 Voluntary retirement of Sri Ram Kishore Saxena	18.7.2005	
732.	Sri Rajendra Kumar		13.6.2005	29.9.94 Elevation to Bench of Sri K.K.Srivastava	13.6.2005	
733.	Sri A.K.Ganesh		16.11.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	16.11.2005	
734.	Sri Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan		.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	.6.2005	
735.	Sri Vikas Kunvar Srivastava		10.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	10.6.2005	
736.	Sri Bhoopendra Sahai		13.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.6.2005	
737.	Sri Virendra Kumar Srivastava		17.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	17.6.2005	
738.	Sri Sanjay Kumar Pachori		13.7.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.7.2005	
739.	Sri Suresh Kumar Gupta		18.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	18.6.2005	
740.	Sushri Ghandikota Shree Devi		30.9.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	30.9.2005	

				Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94		
741.	Sri Kulvinder Singh Jaggi		13.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.6.2005	
742.	Sri Anil Kumar Agrawal		13.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.6.2005	
743.	Sri Ram Achal Yadav		14.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	14.6.2005	
744.	Sri Narendra Kumar Johari		10.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	10.6.2005	
745.	Sri Radhey Shyam Yadav		13.7.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.7.2005	
746.	Sri Raj Beer Singh		26.7.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	26.7.2005	
747.	Sri Ajit Singh		13.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	13.6.2005	
748.	Sri Subhash Chandra Sharma		21.6.2005	21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess.	21.6.2005	

			Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94		
749.	Sri Bhopal Singh		15.6.2005 21.10.94 Creation of 55 courts/posts of Addl. Distt. & Sess. Judges under G.O No. 442/VII-Nya-2-217/79 dated 21.10.94	15.6.2005	



**Seniority List of Officer of J.O. Cadre Working as on 24.5.1984 in H.J.S.**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Name of Officers</b>	<b>Date of Officiation in H.J.S.</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>	<b>Date of availability of vacancy/ caused by</b>
1.	Rajeshwar Prasad Gupta-II	05.08.1980	30.6.95	30.6.84 Retirement of Sri P.N.Roy
2.	Radhey Sayam Verma	11.08.1980	31.12.85	31.7.84 Retirement of A.Lsrivastava
3.	Mahendra Kumar Sangal	31.03.1981	31.1.90	31.7.84 Retirement of Sri Daya Shanker
4.	Murari Lal Agarwal	14.04.1981	30.6.86	31.8.84 Retirement of Sri J.P.Agarwal-I
5.	Ram Krishna Khanna	14.04.1981	31.12.86	19/20.9.84 Death of Sri D.N.Shukla
6.	Jhamman Lal	14.04.1981	31.6.96	29.9.84 Creation of one post of Joint Secretary (Law) and Joint L.R. U.P., Lucknow under G.O. No. 272/VII-HC 45/80 dated 29.9.1984
7.	Niranjan Prasad Verma	25.04.1981	31.1.91	31.10.84 Retirement of Sri Giri Raj Kishore
8.	Brij Lal Sachdeva	26.04.1981	31.8.90	31.12.84 Retirement of Sri S.K.Agnihotri
9.	Ram Shanker Pandey	05.06.1981	29.2.92	31.1.85 Retirement of Sri Ruri Mal
10.	Daya Shanker Misra	16.05.1981	30.4.88	31.1.86 Retirement of Sri R.C.Awasthy

11.	Ramesh Chandra Srivastava	30.05.1981	30.4.92	28.2.86 Retirement of Sri Rajendra Narain Sinha
12.	Bhikka Lal	30.05.1981	31.5.86	26.4.86 Death of Sri Harish Chandra Verma
13.	Krishna Murari Chaturvedi	31.05.1981	7.1.94 <b>Died</b>	31.5.86 Retirement of Sri Bhikkha Lal
14.	Prabhu Nath Lal	06.06.1981	31.7.92	30.6.86 Retirement of Sri Anirudh Kumar Agarwal
15.	Rajendra Nath	15.06.1981	31.10.94	31.7.86 Retirement of Sri V.S.Agarwal
16.	Jai Shanker Dubey	15.06.1981	30.6.95	6.8.86 Creation of 4 posts, Viz. Director-1, Additional Director-1, Joint Director-2, in JTRI, U.P. Lucknow under G.O. No. 2034/VII-HC/86-54/Dated 6.8.86.
17.	Yogendra Sahai Raizada	09.04.1981	31.5.92	6.8.86 Creation of 4 posts, Viz. Director-1, Additional Director-1, Joint Director-2, in JTRI, U.P. Lucknow under G.O. No. 2034/VII-HC/86-54/Dated 6.8.86.
18.	Goverdhan Lal Gupta	10.04.1981	12.12.91 <b>Died</b>	30.9.86 Retirement of Sri Basant Kumar Misra
19.	Ichhra Nand Thakral	10.04.1981	30.4.90	10.11.86 Creation of one post of Special officer (Vigilance) HC, Alld. under G.O. No. 3008/VII-HC-536/86 dated 10.11.86.
20.	Ram Chandra Shukla-II	03.07.1982	<b>C.R.</b> 8.4.96	12.12.86 Death of Sri V.S.Kulshrestha
21.	Imtiaz Uddin	07.07.1982	30.6.95	12.12.86 Creation of 5 Courts/posts of Addl. D.J. in district Mirzapur for Banwasi Court created under G.O.No. 7534/VII-AN-742/86, Dated 12.12.86
22.	Bishambar Gopal Saxena	07.07.1982	31.7.98	31.12.86 Retirement of Sri Ram Kumar Saxena
23.	Rajendra Lal Soni	12.07.1982	31.10.94	28.2.87 Retirement of Sri D.N.Khanna
24.	Pratap Narain Mehrotra	28.09.1982	<b>V.R.</b>	31.3.87

			31.8.94	Retirement of Sri M.P.S.Tomar
25.	Girja Shankar Chaube	17.07.1982	30.6.95	31.5.87 Retirement of Sri B.P.Srivastava
26.	Krishna Pal Singh	17.07.1982	30.11.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
27.	Ramendra Kumar Srivastava	19.07.1982	30.4.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
28.	Ram Kishore Saxena	22.07.1982	<b>V.R.</b> 27.4.94	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
29.	Rabindra Nath Awasthi	24.07.1982	31.7.95	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
30.	Surendra Kumar Garg	30.07.1982	31.7.95	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
31.	Jai Ram Misra	30.07.1982	30.9.95	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
32.	Devendra Pal Singh	08.07.1982	31.10.96	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
33.	Dinesh Mohan Arya	25.08.1982	15.5.93 <b>Died</b>	27.6.87 Creation of 25 courts/posts of Addl. D.J. under G.O. No. 3308/VII-AN-726/85 dated 27.6.87
34.	Siddartha Muni Goel	27.08.1982	30.4.99	30.6.87 Retirement of Sri V.D.Keshari
35.	Praduman Kumar	01.06.1983	<b>V.R.</b> 14.2.97	29.2.88 Retirement of Sri D.K.Agarwal
36.	Mahesh Chandra	02.08.1983	<b>V.R.</b> 31.5.98	31.3.88 Retirement of Sri Manphool Singh
37.	Radha Krishna Gupta	16.07.1983	<b>C.R.</b> 27.6.98	30.4.88 Retirement of Sri D.S.Misra
38.	Dinesh Chandra Verma	17.07.1983	<b>V.R.</b> 22.6.94	31.10.88 Retirement of Sri Naresh Chandra Jain-I
39.	Rajendra Prasad Singh	19.07.1983	31.1.98	30.11.88

				Retirement of Sri D.L.Soni
40.	Rudresh Kumar	19.07.1983	28.2.98	31.1.89 Retirement of Sri Govind Prasad Srivastava
41.	Shitla Prasad Srivastava	21.07.1983	31.7.2000	31.3.89 Retirement of Sri Shivadhar Tiwari
42.	Shri Pal	23.07.1983	30.9.96	31.5.89 Retirement of Sri Rati Ram
43.	Rameshwar Sarup Garg	23.07.1983	29.5.95 <b>Died</b>	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89
44.	Kesri Nandan Singh	23.07.1983	<b>C.R.</b> 8.3.95	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89
45.	Jagdish Singh	23.07.1983	<b>C.R.</b> 23.8.97	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89
46.	Khem Singh	29.07.1983	31.7.99	30.6.89 Creation of 25 courts/ posts of Addl.D.J. due to upgradation of 25 courts/posts of Civil Judges under G.O.No.2177/VII-AN-726/85, Dated 30.6.89
47.	Qazi Khurshed Ahmad	30.07.1983	31.7.2002	28.2.91 Retirement of Sri Narain Dass
48.	Mahabir Saran Nigam	30.07.1983	31.12.2000	30.6.91 Retirement of Sri B.C.Shukla
49.	Mohammad Abid	30.07.1983	30.4.99	30.9.91 Retirement of Sri Shiv Nath Misra
50.	Ram Behari Lal Dohare	30.07.1983	31.7.92	31.12.91 Retirement of Sri Bijai Kumar Srivastava
51.	Pratap Singh	30.07.1983	<b>C.R.</b> 11.8.98	31.1.92 Retirement of Sri Jagdish Prasad Semwal
52.	Purshottam Swarup Malhotra	12.08.1983	31.1.96	4.2.92 Elevation to Bench of Sri A.N.Gupta

Sd/-  
**(S.S. Kulshrestha)**

Sd/-  
**(Ashok Bhushan)**

Sd/-  
**(Sunil Ambwani)**

Sd/-  
**(R.K. Agarwal)**

Sd/-  
**(B.S. Chauhan)**

