



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE EASWARAN S.

THURSDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MAY 2024 / 2ND JYAISHTA, 1946

OP (CAT) NO. 83 OF 2024

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 24.07.2023 IN OA NO.469 OF
2022 OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA
REP. BY THE SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, SHASTRI
BHAVAN, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 2 THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PRASAR BHARATI BROADCASTING CORPORATION OF INDIA,
COPERNICUS MARG NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 3 THE DIRECTOR GENERAL
ALL INDIA RADIO, AKASHVANI BHAVAN, SANSAD MARG,
NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 4 THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF DOORDARSHAN
DOORDARSHAN BHAVAN COPERNICUS MARG, NEW DELHI,
PIN - 110001
- 5 THE NODAL PUBLIC GRIEVANCE OFFICER
(THE JOINT SECRETARY) FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS
& PUBLIC GRIEVANCES, MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
BROADCASTING, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 6 THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL,
DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, KUDAPPANAKUNNU P.O
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695043
- 7 THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL,
AKASHVANI, ALL INDIA RADIO, VAZHUTHAKADU P.O
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 014.

BY ADVS.
R.V.SREEJITH, SCGC

RESPONDENT/APPLICANT:

SUNNY JOSEPH
AGED 58 YEARS
ASSISTANT ENGINEER DOORDARSHAN KENDRA,



2024/KER/34876

OP (CAT) NO. 83 OF 2024

2

KUDAPPANAKUNNU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 043
(PRESENTLY WORKING AS ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
(ENGINEERING), AKASHVANI, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM),
RESIDING AT KALLIYADICKAL HOUSE, TC 12/757,
MADANKOVIL LANE, MUTTADA P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.,
PIN - 695025

BY ADVS.

M.P.KRISHNAN NAIR

SEEMA KRISHNAN(S-1457)

T.D.SUSMITH KUMAR(K/65/2004)

THIS OP (CAT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23.05.2024,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**"C.R"****AMIT RAWAL & EASWARAN S., JJ.****-----
OP (CAT) No.83 of 2024
-----****Dated this the 23rd day of May, 2024****J U D G M E N T**Easwaran, J.

Respondents in Original Application No.469/2022 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench are before this Court in the present Original Petition. The Original Application was filed by the respondent herein seeking to challenge Annexures-A14, A15, A17, A19, A21, A24, A25, A28 and A31 orders. The grievance of the applicant before the Central Administrative Tribunal was that the petitioners herein rejected his request made by him for correction of date of birth entered in the service records.

2. The facts pleaded in the Original Application show that the applicant before the Central Administrative Tribunal entered service as an Engineering Assistant on 07.11.1989. At the time of his appointment, the date of birth entered in the service records as per the entries in the SSLC Book was



01.06.1964. Later, the applicant claimed that his actual date of birth is 02.07.1964. Further, it is contended that the said fact came to the knowledge of the applicant only when he took a copy of the birth certificate on 10.04.2007. Immediately thereafter, he approached the State Government for correction of the date of birth in the SSLC records, which was also accepted on 27.06.2007. Later, the applicant claims that the entries in his SSLC Book was corrected as per the order dated 13.01.2012 and consequent to the correction in the SSLC Book, the applicant before the Central Administrative Tribunal submitted representation to the Director of All India Radio, Vazhuthakadu on 16.7.2013 produced as Annexure-A13 before the Central Administrative Tribunal. The representation was thereafter answered on 5.8.2013, which is evident from Annexure-A14. Though in Annexure-A14 representation was forwarded, the authorities *prima facie* entertained an opinion that since the applicant has sought for correction of date of birth in the service records after five years after the date of entry into service, the same is not in accordance with the



instructions contained in DoP&T Office Memorandum No.19017/2/92-Estt(A) dated 19.05.1993. Despite this, the representation was forwarded for further consideration. After a series of inter-departmental communications finally by Annexure-A24 dated 04.02.2015 the Deputy Director (Administration), India's Public Service Broadcaster Directorate General, All India Radio, New Delhi addressed to the Director of All India Radio, Thiruvananthapuram informing him that the application for correction of date of birth in the service records of the respondent/applicant herein stood rejected and the decision of the competent authority may be communicated to the respondent/applicant. Later, on 09.03.2015, the request for replacement of Aadhar card submitted by the respondent/applicant was also rejected, since the date of birth entered in the service records as well as the document now sought to be replaced were found to be different.

3. Consequent to the above proceeding, it was noticed by order dated 06.05.2015 that the respondent/applicant had not registered himself in the bio-metric attendance system.



Therefore, he was further directed to register himself for the bio-metric attendance system immediately. To the said order, the respondent/applicant replied under Annexure-A27 dated 22.05.2015 that his application for correction of date of birth in the service records is still pending and that the date of birth in the Aadhar Card and other related documents was corrected based on the corrected date of birth. After a series of further proceedings, by Annexure-A28 dated 06.01.2020, it was ordered that it is not possible to accept the documents with the change of date of birth, once the date of birth in the service records had been recorded. However, to ascertain as to whether there is a change in the existing Rules, the matter was placed before the Director General. In the meantime, the petitioner also invoked the mechanism provided for public grievance, which was also turned down by order dated 04.08.2022, which is evident from Annexure-A31.

4. Immediately after passing Annexure-A31 order, the respondent/applicant approached the Central Administrative



Tribunal with the present Original Application on which the order impugned was passed.

5. The respondents in the Original Application/the petitioners herein entered appearance and contested the claim. Petitioners/respondents raised their objections to the belated claim of the respondent/applicant for correction of the date of birth. It was specifically contended that the applicant's request for change of date of birth was only after completing 23.5 years of regular service and therefore it was highly belated.

6. Based on the pleadings on record, the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench concluded that the change of the date of birth in the service records would only alter the period of service by 32 days and consequently, the applicant's retirement would stand deferred from 31.5.2024 to 31.7.2024. It was further held that no additional burden will have to be borne by the respondents and accordingly, the Original Application was allowed vide Ext.P6 order dated 24.07.2023. It is aggrieved by the aforesaid order that the Union of India and others are before this Court invoking the



power of superintendence under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

7. We have heard Sri.R.V.Sreejith, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/respondents, and Sri.M.P.Krishnan Nair, learned counsel appearing for the respondent/applicant.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners/respondents would contend that the Tribunal erred egregiously in entertaining a belated claim for correction of date of birth in the service records. As per the prevalent rules, the applicant ought to have raised a claim within a period of five years from the date of entering into service. It was also submitted that even the claim before the Tribunal was not maintainable, since it was a belated claim as the cause of action for filing the Original Application arose in the year 2015, and therefore the present Original Application could not have been entertained by the Tribunal. He also further relied on Rule 56 of the Fundamental Rules, wherein the application for correction of date of birth should have been made within a period of five years from the date of entering into service. Reliance was placed on the



judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India v. Harnam Singh [(1993) 2 SCC 162]**. Further, he also placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of M.P. v. Premlal Shrivastava [(2011) 9 SCC 664]**. Thus, he prayed for setting aside the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal allowing the Original Application.

9. On the other hand, Sri.M.P.Krishnan Nair, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/applicant, made a fervent plea before this Court that his client cannot be found fault with for having approached the authorities in the year 2013 (5.8.2013). He further argued that only after getting the date of birth corrected in the SSLC Book, which was only on 13.1.2012 that he could have moved before the authorities for getting the service records corrected. He further took this Court to Annexure-A3 order passed on 27.6.2007, wherein sanction was accorded by the State Government to correct the SSLC Book of the applicant. It is because of delay between 27.6.2007 and 13.01.2012 that the applicant was disabled from moving before the authorities for correction of date of birth in



the service records. Sri.M.P.Krishnan Nair would further refer to the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent and would contend that the Original Petition filed is not maintainable because of want of proper authority authorising the incumbents to file the present Original Petition. He would also further argue that there was no genuine *bona fide* mistake on the part of his client in not approaching the authorities within the time prescribed. The delay between 2007 to 2012, according to the learned counsel for the respondent/applicant, ought to have been excluded for the purpose of calculating the period as prescribed under the Rules. Still further, he would submit that at this point of time, the respondent/applicant is now required to submit the corrected copies of Aadhar Card and PAN Card for the purpose of processing pension claim. Therefore, the learned counsel would request this Court to take note of the mitigating circumstances and seek to sustain the order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal.

10. We have considered the rival submissions raised across the bar.



11. Before going into the comparative merits of the claim raised by the respondent/applicant before the Tribunal, we are constrained to note that the Tribunal, despite the specific bar under Section 21 of the Central Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985, had chosen to entertain the Original Application, which was highly belated. Section 21 of the Central Administrative Tribunal's Act reads as follows:

"21. Limitation.—

- (1) A Tribunal shall not admit an application,—
 - (a) in a case where a final order such as is mentioned in clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 20 has been made in connection with the grievance unless the application is made, within one year from the date on which such final order has been made;
 - (b) in a case where an appeal or representation such as is mentioned in clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 20 has been made and a period of six months had expired thereafter without such final order having been made, within one year from the date of expiry of the said period of six months.
- (2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), where,—
 - (a) the grievance in respect of which an application is made had arisen by reason of any order made at any time during the period of three years immediately preceding the



date on which the jurisdiction, powers and authority of the Tribunal becomes exercisable under this Act in respect of the matter to which such order relates; and

(b) no proceedings for the redressal of such grievance had been commenced before the said date before any High Court,

the application shall be entertained by the Tribunal if it is made within the period referred to in clause (a), or, as the case may be, clause (b) of sub-section (1) or within a period of six months from the said date, whichever period expires later.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2), an application may be admitted after the period of one year specified in clause (a) or clause (b) of sub-section (1) or, as the case may be, the period of six months specified in sub-section (2), if the applicant satisfies the Tribunal that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within such period."

12. It may be noted that sub-Section (3) of Section 21 begins with a non-obstante clause wherein it was incumbent upon the respondent/applicant to have shown cause before the Tribunal to have the application entertained, despite a delay being caused. With this legal requirement, when we perused the Original Application filed by the respondent herein, which is produced as Ext.P1, there is no explanation caused on the



delay that has occurred in approaching the Tribunal. On a contrary, there is an assertion that the application is within the period of limitation. Still further, the applicant has chosen to calculate the period of limitation from the date of Annexure-A31 order.

13. We are afraid that the approach of the respondent/applicant was not correct. The Tribunal clearly erred in entertaining the application under Section 19 of the Central Administrative Tribunal's Act contrary to the statutory requirement under Section 21. Admittedly, the cause of action arose on 04.02.2015 when request for correction of date of birth of the respondent/applicant in the service records was declined. The proceedings, which led to the issuance of Annexure-A31, had absolutely no bearing or correlation to the cause which was already declined under Annexure-A24 order dated 04.02.2015. The Tribunal failed miserably to appreciate the fact that the cause projected under Annexure-A30, which was rejected under Annexure-A31, was different from that contained under Annexure-A24. In Annexure-A30, the



respondent/applicant only requested for acceptance of the Aadhar Card with the corrected date of birth for the purpose of registering himself in the bio-metric attendance. This has absolutely no relation to the claim for correction of date of birth in the service records. Therefore, we have no hesitation to hold that the application filed before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench was clearly barred by limitation and hit by Section 21 and the Tribunal could not have entertained the said application.

14. Be that as it may, even we assume that the application was within time, we are not persuaded to accept the arguments of the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/applicant. It must be noted that the applicant entered into service on 07.11.1989. At the time of entering service, his date of birth recorded was 01.06.1964. The request for correction of date of birth in the SSLC Book was ordered on 27.06.2007 and the same was corrected on 13.01.2012. There is no explanation as to the delay which occurred between 2007 to 2012. Even assuming that the said



period of delay could have been excluded, even then, the applicant's claim for correction of date of birth in the service records could not have been entertained by the authorities. The respondent/applicant had also not entertained all the steps he had to undertake to have an expeditious issuance of the corrected SSLC Book after Annexure-A3 order.

15. It is now settled law that the correction of date of birth in the service records cannot be claimed as a matter of right. It has been held on numerous occasions by the Supreme Court as well as by the High Courts that belated claim for correction of the date of birth cannot be entertained by the courts. In **State of UP v. Shiv Narain Upadhyaya [2005 (6) SCC 49]**, it has been categorically held by the Supreme Court that an application for correction of date of birth should not be dealt with by the Courts, Tribunals or the High Courts, keeping in view only the public servant concerned. It was further held that any direction for correction of the date of birth of the public servant concerned has a chain reaction, in as much as others waiting for years, below him for their respective



promotions are affected in this process. Even otherwise, it would definitely be a burden on the Exchequer.

16. In a Bench decision of this Court in **Ravindran v. State of Kerala & Others [ILR 2000 (2) Kerala 55]**, it was held by this Court that a government servant cannot apply for correction of date of birth beyond the stipulated period. It was further held that in the absence of any provision in the Rules for correction of date of birth, the general principle of refusing relief on the ground of laches or stale claims is generally applied by the courts and the Tribunals. It is nonetheless competent for the Government to fix a time limit in the service rules, after which no application for correction of date of birth of a Government servant can be entertained.

17. The question as to whether the correction of date of birth could be entertained after the stipulated period of five years based on the Civil Services (General Conditions) Rules, 1981 (Maharashtra) came up for consideration before the Supreme Court in **State of Maharashtra and another v. Gorakhnath Sitaram Kamble & Others [(2010) 14 SCC**



423]. It was held that the spirit and the intention of such rule is reflected in a series of judgments of the Supreme Court. And that an application given after a lapse of 28 years after entering service cannot be considered by the Courts or the Tribunals.

18. In **Punjab and Haryana High Court V. Megh Raj Garg [(2010) 6 SCC 482]**, it was categorically held that once the date of birth is entered in the service records in respect of an employee, it becomes conclusive. On facts of that case, considering the time limit of 2 years provided under the relevant rules, the Apex Court proceeded to hold that the application submitted for correction of date of birth after 2 years cannot be entertained.

19. To cite a few more precedents on this point, we can find the decisions of the Supreme Court in **State of Gujarat and others V. Vali Mohd. Dosabhai Sindhi [2006(6) SCC 537]**, **State of Madhya Pradesh V. Premlal Shrivastava [(2011) 9 SCC 664]** and **Bharat Coking Coal Limited and others V. Chhota Birsa Uranw [(2014) 12 SCC 570]**. The ratio culled out from the said decisions is that the courts/tribunals should not



entertain the request from the employee for correction of date of birth in service records at the fag end of the career. However, this rule is not without exception. Unless there is clinching proof and unimpeachable evidence to show the date of birth of an employee has been wrongly entered in his service record, and a denial of permission to correct the said record would tantamount to denial of justice, the courts have permitted such corrections. When we apply the afore principles to facts, it becomes evident that there was a statutory embargo to apply for correction of date of birth beyond 5 years. The prudence of the employer in prescribing the said embargo being sacrosanct and is not open for judicial review by courts. Here, the application for correction of date of birth was given in the year 2013 and the decision to reject the same was taken in the year 2015. But, since the Original Application was filed only in the year 2022 and the applicant was due to retire during 2024, it becomes clear that he had approached the Tribunal at the fag end of his career. Thus it was not within the domain of the Tribunal to have formed an opinion that even if the request for



entertaining the application for correction of date of birth is allowed, it will not cause any prejudice to the Department. In holding so, the Tribunal completely ignored the settled principles laid down by the High Courts as well as by the Supreme Court.

The result of the above discussion leads to the inevitable conclusion that the petitioners are entitled to succeed. Accordingly, Ext.P6 order dated 24.7.2023 in O.A.No.469/2022 on the files of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench is thus set aside. Resultantly, the Original Application filed by the respondent herein would stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
AMIT RAWAL
JUDGE

Sd/-
EASWARAN S.
JUDGE

APPENDIX OF OP (CAT) 83/2024PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS/ANNEXURES

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Exhibit P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE OA NO.180/00469/2022 OF THE HON'BLE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM FILED BY THE RESPONDENT HEREIN |
| Annexure A1 | TRUE COPY OF THE BIRTH CERTIFICATE DATGED 10.04.2007 ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY, KARIMANNOOR GRAMA PANCHAYAT |
| Annexure A2 | TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 12.04.2007 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA FOR CORRECTION OF DATE OF BIRTH |
| Annexure A3 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 27.06.2007 OF THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA FOR CONDONING THE DELAY IN SYBMITTING APPLICATION |
| Annexure A4 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.K.DIS.EX.BB2/4855/2010/CGE DATED 13.01.2012 OF THE JOINT COMMISSIONER FOR GOVERNMENT EXAMINATIONS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM |
| Annexure A5 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 29.07.2009 ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY, GENERAL EDUCATION DEPT., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM ALONG WITH ITS TYPED COPY |
| Annexure A6 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 03.08.2009 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER (HOD), DOORDARSHAN KNDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM LONG WITH ITS TYPED COPY. |
| Annexure A7 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 14.08.2009 ISSUED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, PRASAR BHARATI, DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, TRIVANDRUM |
| Annexure A8 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 14.08.2009 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE SECRETARYU, GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT. |
| Annexure A9 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 14.01.2010 ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVT. GENERAL EDUCATION DEPT., TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR GOVT. EXAMINATIONS, TRIVANDRUM ALONG WITH ITS TYPED COPY |
| Annexure A10 | TRUE COPY OF THE 1ST PAGE OF THE CORRECTED SSLC BOOK SHOWING THE DATE OF BIRTH AS 02.07.1964 |
| Annexure A11 | TRUE COPY OF THE AADHAR CARD OF THE APPLICANT SHOWING THE ATE OF BIRTH AS 02.07.1964 |
| Annexure A12 | TRUE COPY OF THE PASSPORT OF THE APPLICANT SHOWING THE DATE OF BIRTH AS 02.07.1964 |

**OP (CAT) NO. 83 OF 2024**

- Annexure A13 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 16.07.2013 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE DIRECTOR, ALL INDIA RADIO, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- Annexure A14 TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM NO.TVM-1(2)/2013-S DATED 05.08.2013 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENTS
- Annexure A15 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.TVM-1(2)/2013-S/1128 DATED 05.08.2013 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENTS
- Annexure A16 TRUE COPY OF THE REMINDER DATED 01.11.2013 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE RESPONDENTS
- Annexure A17 TRUE COPY OF THE REMINDER LETTER DATED 11-10/12-11/2013 ISSUED BY THE ADDL.DIRECTOR GENERAL (PRO.) TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT
- Annexure A18 TRUE COPY OF THE REMINDER LETTER DATED 14.02.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE ADDL.DIRECTOR GENERAL(P), ALL INDIA RADIO, TRIVANDRUM
- Annexure A19 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.TVM-1(2)/2013-S/682 DATED 26.02.2014 ISSUED BY THE ADDL.DIRECTOR GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, NEW DELHI
- Annexure A20 TRUE COPY OF THE REMINDER LETTER DATED 02.12.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, NEW DELHI
- Annexure A21 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.TVM-21(2)/2012-S(SJ)/3577 DATED 23.12.2014 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR (P) TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, NEW DELHI
- Annexure A22 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM NO.Z-20025/9/2014-ESTT.(AL) DATED 03.11.2014 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCE & PENSION
- Annexure A23 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM NO.11013/9/2014-ESTT(A-III) DATED 21.11.2014 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES & PENSION.
- Annexure A24 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.14/1/2015-S-IV(B)/44 DATED 04.02.2015 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATION(E), DIRECTORATE GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, NEW DELHI FORWARDED TO THE APPLICANT AS PER ENDORSEMENT NO.TVM-21(2)201-S(SJ) DATED 16.02.2015
- Annexure A25 TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM NO.10(1)2015-A1/DKT/(S)/5288 DATED 09.03.15 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

OP (CAT) NO. 83 OF 2024

22

- Annexure A26 TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM NO.10(1)2015-A1/DKT(SJ) DATED 06.05.2015 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- Annexure A27 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY REPRESENTATION DATED 22.05.2015 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT IN RESPECT OF ANNEX.A26
- Annexure A28 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.7(1)2017/A1/DKT/(SJ) DATED 06.01.2020 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, TRIVANDRUM TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, DOORDARSHAN, NEW DELHI
- Annexure A29 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 02.11.2020 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REQUESTING TO CONSIDER HIS REQUEST FOR CORRECTION OF DATE OF BIRTH IN THE SERVICE BOOK.
- Annexure A30 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT TO THE 5TH RESPONDENT ON 12.11.2021 AND THE APPEAL DATED 11.03.2022 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY.
- Annexure A31 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.7(1)2017/A1/DKT/944 DATED 04.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, TRIVANDRUM TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL (E), DOORDARSHAN KENDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM TO THE APPLICANT REJECTING HIS CLAIM OF CORRECTION OF DATE OF BIRTH IN THE SERVICE BOOK
- Annexure A32 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM NO.55/14/2014/P&PW(C) PART-I DATED 29.11.2016 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES & PENSION, NEW DELHI REGARDING MANDATORY REGISTRATION IN BHAVISHYA PORTAL.
- Annexure A33 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM NO.55/14/2014/P&PW(C) PART-I DATED 21.01.2021 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES & PENSION, NEW DELHI REGARDING MANDATORY REGISTRATION IN BHAVISHYA PORTAL.
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT DATED 03.01.2023 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS IN OA NO.180/00469/2022**
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER DATED 27.01.2023 FILED BY THE APPLICANT IN OA NO.180/00469/2022**
- Annexure A34 TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM DATED 25-08-2023 ISSUED TO THE APPLICANT BY THE 6TH RESPONDENT
- Annexure A35 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 05-01-2023 ISSUED

OP (CAT) NO. 83 OF 2024

23

BY THE SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, ALL INDIA RADIO REGARDING TRANSFER ON PROMOTION OF THE APPLICANT

- Annexure A36 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE ORDER DATED 03-01-2023 ISSUED BY THE 7TH RESPONDENT TO DY. DIRECTOR (E)
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL REPLY STATEMENT DATED 15.05.2023, FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS IN THE ABOVE OA**
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY FOT HE ADDITIONAL REJOINDER DATED 12.06.2023 FILED BY THE APPLICANT IN OA NO.180/00469/2022**
- Annexure A37 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM NO.A-21/2017-IC/E.IIIA DATED 28-11-2019
- Annexure A38 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO,.F.V.22018/3/2023--BAE DATED 23.02.2023 OF THE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 24.07.2023 IN OA NO.180/00469/2022, OF THE TRIBUNAL**

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R1(a) True copy of the DoPT Office Memorandum No. 19017/1/2014-Estt(A-IV) dated 16-12-2014**
- Exhibit R1(b) True copy of the email dated 11-08-2023 forwarding the Order dated 24-07-2023 to the petitioners**
- Exhibit R1(c) True copy of the Memorandum dated 27-02-2024 issued by the Administrative Officer**
- Exhibit R1(d) True copy of the reply dated 29-02-2024 submitted by the respondent herein to the Memorandum**
- Exhibit R1(e) True copy of the representation dated 16-03-2024 submitted by the counsel for the respondent herein to the petitioners**
- Exhibit R1(f) True copy of the representation dated 08-05-2024 submitted by the respondent herein to the petitioners**
- Exhibit R1(g) TRUE COPY OF THE AFORESAID LETTER DATED 13-05-2024 WITH REPLY ENDORSEMENT WITH TYPED COPY**