

**Office of the Addl. Director General of Police, Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.**

No.17507/E-1

Dated Chandigarh, the 11.05.2011

**Subject:- Final Seniority List of Inspectors Operators of Punjab Police
Telecommunication Wing.**

This is continuation to this office order No.1854-1918/E-1 dated 21.1.2011 on the subject cited above

The Tentative Seniority lists of Inspectors (Operator) of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing was prepared on 20.1.2011 and circulated vide this office No. 1854-1918/E-1 dated 21.1.2011. A period of 21 days was afforded to the concerned persons for filing objections, if any.

Inadvertently, it could not be mentioned in the circular letter that only reserve points are to be determined by the Committee (Therefore, the objections have also been submitted raising the other points relating to inter-se-seniority of the promotees as well as probationers, application of Punjab Police Act, 2007, confirmation etc.). In fact the Committee has been constituted for determining the reserve points and further promotions. Since the Committee is only determining the reserve points, therefore, the Committee is not considering the other objections of the personnel for their seniority & further promotions.

The Committee has considered the objections of each Category as follows:-

Inspector (Operators) of General Category & Reserve Category

Inspector Satjit Singh No. 352/W of General Category only has raised certain points for his seniority & application of the Punjab Police Act, 2007. He has nothing said about his promotion & place in the seniority list qua the Reserve Category.

Objection raised by Reserve Category

- a. That the final seniority list issued by dated 4.7.08 was finalized after hearing objections and representations from the concerned and cannot be reopened as per law led down in "Malcom Lawrence Cecil D'Souza versus Union of India and others" AIR 1975 S.C 1269 and " Vinod Kumar Gupta versus State of Haryana and others " 2007 (2) RSJ 454 (D.B.)
- b. That the Seniority list prepared on 20.1.2011 after implementation of the Ajit Singh Janjua is not in vogue in any office as per Govt. instruction issued vide letter dated 15.12.05 for implementation of 85th amendment of Constitution of India.
- c. That D.O letter vide No. 1 / 23 / 09 / RS1 / 914-933 dated 9.7.09 from Chief Secy. for the implementation of Punjab SC/BC Reservation Act, 2006 was not considered while preparing the tentative seniority lists.

- d. Inspector Narain Singh No. 799/W raised objection that General Category Inspectors namely Satjit 352/W, Harmeet Singh 212/W , Krishan Dev 202/W, Pritpal Singh 151/W are junior to him as he was promoted as Inspector on dated 17.7.2008 earlier to them.
- e. Articles 16(4A) of the Constitution of India empowers the State for making any provision for reservation in matter of promotions, with consequential seniority to any class.

During the personal hearing Inspector Narain Singh 799/W, Kuldeep Singh 508/W & Nanak Singh 806/W collectively raised the following points:-

- i. They have been shown as excess promotees against the reserved posts but they were promoted against the reserved posts and are within the limit of reservation.
- ii. Janjua Judgment has not been applied in any department so far, therefore that Judgment should not be applied to their cases also.
- iii. Seniority be prepared in accordance with 85th amendment of Constitution of India and as per instructions of Punjab Govt. dated 15.12.2005.

Their Objections have been considered & decided as follows:

- a. The Judgment so quoted does not debar the department for correcting the wrong/irregularities which has put majority of the officials of General Category to disadvantages. There is no illegality for placing the Roster point Promotees in the seniority at the appropriate place by applying catch up rule as per judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ajit Singh Janjua- II and Govt. notification dated 22.10.1999. As per Govt. Instructions dated 22.10.1999 Roster point promotees (Reserved Category) cannot claim their seniority from the date of their continue officiation in the promoted post, vis-à-vis the general candidates who were senior to them in the lower Category and later promoted,

On the other hand, the senior general candidate at the lower level if he reaches the promotion level later but before the further promotion of the reserve candidate, he will have to be treated as senior, at the promotional level to the reserved candidate even if the reserved candidate was earlier promoted to that level (Para 76 of Ajit Singh -II). Hence, the objection is ignored.

- b. Vide executive instructions No.3/34/99-3PP1/17646 dated 15.12.2005 of the Govt. the consequential seniority on roster promotion was ordered prospectively with effect from 17.11.2005 in the following manner:-

“After the careful consideration of the matter and also keeping in view the interim orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court and the present status of the case pending in the Apex court, it has been decided that Scheduled Caste employees

promoted to any class or classes of posts under the reservation policy, will be prospectively entitled to “consequential seniority” on the post to which they are promoted.

These instructions shall come into force w.e.f. 17th November, 2005 and shall be applicable to the posts falling vacant in future in all cadres. They are also subject to the final decision of the Hon’ble Apex Court in I A No. 2 in writ petition (Civil) No. 61/2002-M.Nagraj and others V/s Union of India and others and writ petition (Civil) No. 234/2002-All India Equality Form and others V/s Union of India and others and other allied cases.”

These instructions were considered in CWP No. 1960 of 2008- Pritpal Singh v/s State of Punjab and it was decided by Hon’ble Punjab and Haryana high Court that the Reservation Act, 2006 does not contain any provision for consequential seniority. Govt. Instructions dated 15.12.05 and Govt. circular dated 4.5.1974 had been quashed. SLPs filed by Govt. of Punjab and Sh. Tara Singh belonging to reserve Category were dismissed on 13.5.2010 and 16.11.10 respectively. The decision of Hon’ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 9.9.2009 in the case of Pritpal Singh is based on the final decision of M. Nagraj & Others in Civil Writ Petition No. 61/2002 dated 19.10.2006. CWP No. 16733 of 2006(O&M) decided on 01.04.2011 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others wherein the petitioner seeking of implementation of the 85th Constitutional amendment. The same has been dismissed on the plea that State has not enacted or made any provision for grant of consequential seniority to roster promottees as mandated by Article 16(4A). However, this judgment has also been referred to the reporter. Hence, the objection is ignored.

c. The Seniority has been prepared in accordance with the Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 and provision of the Punjab Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes (Reservations in Services) Act-2006. Hence, the objections ignored.

d. Sh. Narain Singh was promoted as Inspector on dated 17.7.2008 and Inspectors namely Pritpal Singh 151/W, Krishan Dev 202/W, Harmeet Singh 212/W and Satjit 352/W were promoted on 4.2.2009 & 30.3.2010 respectively. These Inspectors were though promoted later-on but they are senior to Inspector Narain Singh in the feeder cadre i.e. Constable as per comparative chart given below:-

S. No.	Name	Date of Enlistment as Constable
1.	Inspr. Pritpal Singh 151/W	07.05.1973
2.	Inspr. Krishan Dev 202/W	19.08.1973
3.	Inspr. Harmeet Singh 212/W	01.07.1974

4. Inspr. Satjit 352/W 15.07.1974

5. **Inspr. Narain Singh 799/W 29.11.1974**

Therefore, these officials have regained their seniority as per Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 & their names have been rightly placed above Inspector Narain Singh No. 799/W. Hence, objection of Sh. Narain Singh & others similar Inspectors belonging to reserve categories are ignored.

e. The Hon'ble Supreme Court concluded in the case of M. Nagraj and Others V/s Union of India on 19.10.2006 as under:-

∴ "The impugned Constitutional Amendments by which Articles (16 (4A) and 16 (4B) have been inserted flow from article 16 (4). They do not alter the structure of Article 16 (4). They retain the controlling factors or the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness and inadequacy of representation which enables the States to provide for reservation keeping in mind the overall efficiency of the State administration under Article 335. These impugned amendments are confined only to SCs and STs. They do not obliterate any of the constitutional requirements, namely, ceiling-limit of 50 % (quantitative limitations), the sub-classification between OBC on one hand and SCs and STs on the other hand as held in Indra Sawhney, the concept of post-based Roster with in-built concept of replacement as held in R.K Sabharwal.

We reiterate that the ceiling-limit of 50% the concept of creamy layer and the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency are all constitutional requirements without which the structure of equality of opportunity in Article 16 would collapse.

However, in this case, as stated, the main issue concerns the "extent of reservation". In this regard the concerned State will have to show in each case the existence of the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency before making provision for reservation. As stated above, the impugned provision is an enabling provision. The State is not bound to make reservation for SC/ST in matter of promotions. However if they wish to exercise their discretion and make such provision, the State has to collect quantifiable data showing backwardness of the class and inadequacy of representation of that class in public employment in addition to compliance of Article 335. It is made clear that even if the State has compelling reasons, as stated above, the State will have to see that its reservation provision does not lead to excessiveness so as to breach the ceiling –limit of 50% of obliterate the creamy layer or extend the reservation indefinitely.

Subject to above, we uphold the constitutional validity of the constitution (Seventy-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1995, the Constitution (Eighty-First

Amendment) Act 2000, the constitution (Eighty–Second Amendment) Act, 2000 and the Constitution (Eighty-Fifth Amendment Act, 2001.”

From the above decision of Hon’ble Supreme Court, it is clear that provision for reservation in the matter of promotion with consequential seniority to any class is only an enabling provision. Hence the objection is ignored.

Sh. Narain Singh was promoted as Inspector on dated 17.7.2008 and Inspectors namely Pritpal Singh 151/W, Krishan Dev 202/W, Harmeet Singh 212/W and Satjit 352/W were promoted 4.2.2009 & 30.3.2010 respectively. These Inspectors were though promoted later-on but they are senior to Inspector Narain Singh in the feeder cadre i.e. Constable as their comparative chart is shown below:-

Name	Date of Enlistment as Constable
Inspr. Pritpal Singh 151/W	07.05.1973
Inspr. Krishan Dev 202/W	19.08.1973
Inspr. Harmeet Singh 212/W	01.07.1974
Inspr. Satjit 352/W	15.07.1974
Inspr. Narain Singh 799/W	29.11.1974

Therefore, these officials have regained their seniority as per Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 & their names have been rightly placed above Inspector Narain Singh No. 799/W. Hence, objections of Sh. Narain Singh & others similar Inspectors belonging to Reserve Categories are ignored.

All the pleas raised by the officials in their representations have been considered objectively keeping in view the Judgments of Hon’ble Supreme Court in the cases of R.K. Sabharwal, Ajit Singh Janjua and writ petition (Civil) No. 61 of 2002 M.Nagraj V/s Union of India and others. The Judgment of Hon’ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1960 of 2008 and CWP No. 16733 of 2006 decided on 01.04.2011. Some other parameters taken for the finalization of the seniority are mentioned below:-

- The Punjab Schedule Castes and Backward Classes (Reservation in Services) Act, 2006.
- Punjab Govt. instructions issued vide no. 3/34/99/3-PPI/12565, dated 22.10.1999.
- On the basis of their date of promotion, enlistment and inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing in the year 1978.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of

Constable/ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 1991.

- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978 & 1991, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable / ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 2008.

All the clerical mistakes which are brought in the notice by the representationists have been corrected in the Final Seniority list, on the basis of record available in this office.

No other material illegality irregularity or discrepancies but so ever have been pointed in the tentative seniority list. Accordingly representations submitted by the officials of this wing are disposed off and the seniority list is finalized. However, the seniority is subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWPs No. 15365/1998, 2228/2000, 12086/2008, 12586/2008 & 13099/2008 and other court cases.

However, the Government reserves the right to revise the same in case of any administrative exigencies arising out of any judicial pronouncement.

A copy of the final seniority list is enclosed herewith.

This be brought to the notice of all the concerned.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

No.17508-61/E-1 Dated: Chandigarh the: 11.05.2011

A copy of the above is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action within stipulated period, please acknowledge receipt.

1. Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh.
2. Director General of Police, Vigilance Bureau Punjab, Chandigarh.
3. Addl. Director General of Police, Intelligence, Punjab, Chandigarh.
4. PA/ADGP/IT&T, Punjab, Chandigarh.
5. The Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication Punjab Chandigarh.
6. All Dy. Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
7. All SDCs in Punjab.
8. I/C R/BGH, J/Khelan, PAP JALL, L/Kothi, KSL & Sri N/Devi Ji
9. Training Inspector (wireless) PPA Phillaur.
10. MI, CI, I/C Cipher Cell, Inspr. HQRs. RI Police lines IT&T Mohali
11. Supdt./E, Supdt./ Acct. Supdt./Mod.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

Office of the Addl. Director General of Police, Information Technology & Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.

No.17562/E-1

Dated Chandigarh, the 11.05.11

Subject:- Final Seniority List of SIs Operators of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing.

This is continuation to this office order No.1854-1918/E-1 dated 21.1.2011 on the subject cited above.

The Tentative Seniority lists of SIs (Operator) of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing was prepared on 20.1.2011 and circulated vide dated 21.1.2011. A period of 21 days was afforded to the concerned persons for filing objections, if any.

Inadvertently, it could not be mentioned in the circular letter that only reserve points are to be determined by the Committee (Therefore, the objections have also been submitted raising the other points relating to inter-se-seniority of the promotees as well as probationers, application of Punjab Police Act, 2007, confirmation etc.). In fact the Committee has been constituted for determining the reserve points and further promotions. Since the Committee is only determining the reserve points, therefore, the Committee is not considering the other objections of the personnel for their seniority & further promotions.

Sub-Inspector (Operators) of General Category & Reserve Category

Objection raised by Sub-Inspector Operators (probationers)

The officials belonging from SC Category wrongly promoted as Insprs in excess of their quota should be reverted to the rank of SI and their promotions be treated as adhoc.

Objection has been considered & decided as follows:

The promotions of the officials belonging to S.C. Category who were wrongly promoted prior to 10.02.95 in excess of Quota no reversions to be made but seniority to be re-determined. Such promotees can not plead for grant of additional benefit of seniority following from wrong application of roster. Seniority is to be re-determined according to correct application of roaster. Promotion made due to wrong application of roaster till 10.02.95 are protected from reversions, however, seniority is to be re-fixed. Promotion of Inspectors made after 10.02.95 in excess of the Quota should be reviewed.

Objections raised by Sub-Inspector (Operators) Reserve Category

- a. That the final seniority list issued by dated 4.7.08 was finalized after hearing objection and representation from the concerned and cannot be reopened as per law led down in "Malcom Lawrence Cecil D'Souza versus union of India and others" AIR 1975 S.C 1269 and "Vinod Kumar Gupta versus State of Haryana and others" 2007 (2) RSJ 454 (D.B.)
- b. That the Seniority list prepared on 20.1.2011 after implementation the Ajit Singh Janjua which is not in vogue in any of the office Punjab Govt. as per Govt. instruction issued vide letter dated 15.12.05 for implementation of 85th amendment of constitution of India.
- c. That the D.O letter vide No. 1 / 23 / 09 / RS1 / 914-933 dated 9.7.09 from Chief Secy. Punjab for the implementation of Punjab SC/BC reservation act 2006 not considered while preparing the tentative seniority list
- d. That the SIs belonging to reserve Category raised common objections that the officials belonging to General Category are junior to them as they are promoted into next rank earlier to them.
- e. Articles 16(4A) of the Constitution of India 1950 empowers the state from making any provision for reservation in matter of promotion, with consequential seniority to any class.

Their Objections have been considered & decided as follows:

- a. The judgement so quoted in the in the Para did not debar the department for correcting the wrong/irregularities which has put majority of the officials of general Category to gross disadvantages. There is no illegality for placing the Roster point Promotees in the seniority at the appropriate places by applying catch up rule as per judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ajit Singh Janjua, and Govt. notification dated 22.10.1999. As per Govt. Instructions dated 22.10.1999 Roster point promotees (Reserved Category) cannot claim their seniority in the promoted Category from the date of their continues officiation in the promoted post, vis-à-vis the general candidates who were senior to them in the lower Category and who were later promoted, On the other hand , the senior general candidate at the lower level if he reached the promotion level later but before the further promotion of the reserve candidate, he will have to be treated as senior, at the promotional level to the reserved candidate even if the reserved candidate was earlier promoted to that level (Para 76 of Ajit Singh -II). Hence, the objection is ignored.
- b. Vide executive instructions No.3/34/99-3PP1/17646 dated 15.12.2005 the consequential seniority on roster promotion was ordered prospectively with effect from 17.11.2005 in the following manner:-

“After the careful consideration of the matter and also keeping in view the interim orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court and the present status of the case pending in the Apex court, it has been decided that scheduled caste employees promoted to any class or classes of posts under the reservation policy, will be prospectively entitled to “consequential seniority” on the post to which they are promoted.

These instructions shall come into force w.e.f. 17th November, 2005 and shall be applicable to the posts falling vacant in future in all cadres. They are also subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in I A No. 2 in writ petition (Civil) No. 61/2002-M.Nagraj and others V/s Union of India and others and writ petition (Civil) No. 234/2002-All India Equality Form and others V/s Union of India and others and other allied cases.”

These instructions were considered in CWP No. 1960 of 2008-Pritpal Singh v/s State of Punjab and it was decided by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana high Court that the reservation act 2006 does not contain any provision for consequential seniority. Govt. Instructions dated 15.12.05 and Govt. circular dated 4.5.1974 has been quashed. SLPs filed by Govt. of Punjab and Sh. Tara Singh belonging to reserve Category have been dismissed on 13.5.2010 and 16.11.10 respectively. The decision of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 9.9.2009 in the case of Pritpal Singh is based on the final decision of M. Nagraj & Others in Civil Wirt Petition No. 61/2002 dated 19.10.2006. CWP No. 16733 of 2006(O&M) decided on 01.04.2011 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others wherein the petitioner seeking of implementation of the 85th Constitutional amendment. The same has been dismissed on the plea that State has not enacted or made any provision for grant of consequential seniority to roster promotees as mandated by Article 16(4A). However, this judgment has also been referred to the reporter. Hence, the objection is ignored.

- c. The Seniority has been prepared in accordance with the Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 and provision of the Punjab Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes (Reservations in Services) Act-2006 has been complied with. Hence, the objection is ignored.
- d. Though the official belongs from General Category promoted later in the next rank but they are senior to officials of Reserve Category in the feeder cadre i.e. Constable.

Therefore, these officials have regained their seniority as per Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 & their names have been rightly placed above the officials belonging to reserve categories. Hence, the objection is ignored.

- e. The Hon'ble Supreme Court concluded in the case of M. Nagraj and Others V/s Union of India on 19.10.2006 as under:-

“The impugned constitutional amendments by which Articles (16 (4A) and 16 (4B) have been inserted flow from article 16 (4). They do not alter the structure of Article 16 (4). They retain the controlling factors or the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness and inadequacy of representation which enables the States to provide for reservation keeping in mind the overall efficiency of the State administration under Article 335. these impugned amendments are confined only to SCs and STs. They do not obliterate any of the constitutional requirements, namely, ceiling-limit of 50% (quantitative limitations), the sub-classification between OBC on one hand and SCs and STs on the other hand as held in Indra Sawhney, the concept of post-based Roster with in-built concept of replacement as held in R.K Sabharwal.

We reiterate that the ceiling-limit of 50% the concept of creamy layer and the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency are all constitutional requirements without which the structure of equality of opportunity in Article 16 would collapse.

However, in this case, as stated, the main issue concerns the “extent of reservation”. In this regard the concerned State will have to show in each case the existence of the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency before making provision for reservation. As stated above, the impugned provision is an enabling provision. The State is not bound to make reservation for SC/ST in matter of promotions. However if they wish to exercise their discretion and make such provision, the State has to collect quantifiable data showing backwardness of the class and inadequacy of representation of that class in public employment in addition to compliance of Article 335. It is made clear that even if the State has compelling reasons, as stated above, the State will have to see that its reservation provision does not lead to excessiveness so as to breach the ceiling –limit of 50% of obliterate the creamy layer or extend the reservation indefinitely.

Subject to above, we uphold the constitutional validity of the constitution (Seventy-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1995, the Constitution (Eighty-First Amendment) Act, 2000, The constitution (Eighty-Second Amendment) Act, 2000 and the Constitution (Eighty-Fifth Amendment Act, 2000.”

From the above decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is clear that provision for reservation in the matter of promotion with consequential seniority to any class is only an enabling provision. Hence the objection is ignored.

An opportunity of personal hearing has also been granted to the Officials who have opted for the same and heard by the seniority committee on 26.04.11. and 03.05.2011 respectively. The points raised at the time of appearance were the same as already mentioned in their representations. No new points were raised, hence the objections have already been considered and rejected.

All the pleas raised by the officials in their representations have been considered objectively keeping in view the Judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of R.K. Sabharwal, Ajit Singh Janjua and writ petition (Civil) No. 61 of 2002 M.Nagraj V/s Union of India and others. The Judgement of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1960 of 2008 and CWP No. 16733 of 2006 decided on 01.04.2011. Some other parameters taken for the finalization of the seniority are mentioned below:-

- The Punjab Schedule Castes and Backward Classes (Reservation in Services) Act, 2006.
- Punjab Govt. instructions issued vide no. 3/34/99/3-PPI/12565, dated 22.10.1999.

- On the basis of their date of promotion, enlistment and inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing in the year 1978.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable/ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 1991.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978 & 1991, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable / ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 2008.

All the clerical mistakes which are brought in the notice by the representationists have been corrected in the Final Seniority list, on the basis of record available in this office.

No other material illegality irregularity or discrepancies but so ever have been pointed in the tentative seniority list. Accordingly representations submitted by the officials of this wing are disposed off and the seniority list is finalized. However, the seniority is subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWPs No. 15365/1998, 2228/2000, 12086/2008, 12586/2008 & 13099/2008 and other court cases.

However, the Government reserves the right to revise the same in case of any administrative exigencies arising out of any judicial pronouncement.

A copy of the final seniority list is enclosed herewith.

This be brought to the notice of all the concerned.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

No. 17563-616/E-1 Dated:Chandigarh the: 11.05.2011

A copy of the above is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action within stipulated period, please acknowledge receipt.

12. Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh.
13. Director General of Police, Vigilance Bureau Punjab, Chandigarh.
14. Addl. Director General of Police, Intelligence, Punjab, Chandigarh.
15. O/o the Addl. Director General of Police Information Technology & Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
16. The Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication Punjab Chandigarh.
17. I/C CM Security Punjab, Chandigarh.
18. All Dy. Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
19. All SDCs in Punjab.
20. I/C IT Stations Bahadurgarh, Jahan Khelan, Phillaur, PAP Jalandhar, Ladda Kothi, Kasauli And Sri Naina Devi Ji (HP)
21. Training Inspector (wireless) PPA Phillaur.
22. MI, CI, I/C Cipher Cell, Inspr. Technical Stores, Inspr. HQRs. RI Police lines IT&T Mohali & Supdt./E, Supdt./ Acct. Supdt./Mod.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

Office of the Addl. Director General of Police, Information Technology & Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.

No.17617/E-1

Dated Chandigarh, the 11.05.11

Subject:- Final Seniority List of ASIs Operators of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing.

This is continuation to this office order No.1854-1918/E-1 dated 21.1.2011 on the subject cited above.

The Tentative Seniority lists of ASIs (Operator) of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing was prepared on 20.1.2011 and circulated vide dated 21.1.2011. A period of 21 days was afforded to the concerned persons for filing objections, if any.

Inadvertently, it could not be mentioned in the circular letter that only reserve points are to be determined by the Committee (Therefore, the objections have also been submitted raising the other points relating to inter-se-seniority of the promotees as well as probationers, application of Punjab Police Act, 2007, confirmation etc.). In fact the Committee has been constituted for determining the reserve points and further promotions. Since the Committee is only determining the reserve points, therefore, the Committee is not considering the other objections of the personnel for their seniority & further promotions.

Asstt. Sub-Inspector (Operators) of General Category & Reserve Category

Objections raised by Asstt. Sub-Inspector Operators (probationers)

That the officials belonging to SC Category were wrongly promoted as Sub Insprs in excess of their quota should be reverted to the rank of ASIs and their promotion may also to be treated as adhoc.

Objections have been considered & decided as follows:

The promotions of the officials belonging to SC Category who were wrongly promoted prior to 10.02.95 in excess of Quota no reversion to be made but seniority to be re-determined. Such promotees can not plead for grant of additional benefit of seniority following from wrong application of roster. Seniority is to be re-determined according to correct application of roaster. Promotion made due to wrong application of roaster till 10.02.95 are protected from reversions however seniority is to be re-fixed. Promotion of Inspectors made after 10.02.95 in excess of the Quota will be reviewed.

Objections raised by Asstt. Sub-Inspector (Operators) Reserve Category

- a. That the service of the officials are being governed under the PPR-1934 as special law therefore the service of applicant does not governed under the C.S.R for the appointment and condition of service.
- b. That the Promotion for one rank to other rank are made as per chapter 13 of PPR-1934.
- c. That the final seniority list issued by dated 4.7.08 was finalized after hearing objection and representation from the concerned and cannot be reopened as per law led down in “ Malcom Lawrence Cecil D’Souza versus union of India and others” AIR 1975 S.C 1269 and “ Vinod Kumar Gupta versus State of Haryana and others “ 2007 (2) RSJ 454 (D.B.)
- d. That the Seniority list prepared on 20.1.2011 after implementation the Ajit Singh Janjua which is not in vogue in any of the office Punjab Govt. as per Govt. instruction issued vide letter dated 15.12.05 for implementation of 85th amendment of constitution of India.
- e. That the D.O letter vide No. 1 / 23 / 09 / RS1 / 914-933 dated 9.7.09 from Chief Secy. Punjab for the implementation of Punjab SC/BC reservation act 2006 not considered while preparing the tentative seniority list

- f. That the ASIs belonging to reserve Category raised common objections that the officials belonging to General Category are junior to them as they are promoted into next rank earlier to them.
- g. Articles 16(4A) of the Constitution of India 1950 empowers the state from making any provision for reservation in matter of promotion, with consequential seniority to any class.

Their Objections have been considered & decided as follows:

- a. The services of the officials are being governed under the PPR-1934 as well as Punjab C.S.R.
- b. This issue has already been decided by the high power committee constituted by DGP Punjab under the chairmanship of Sh. Kuldeep Singh IPS and others in year 2008. Hence, the objection is ignored.
- c. The judgement so quoted in the in the Para did not debar the department for correcting the wrong/irregularities which has put majority of the officials of general Category to gross disadvantages. There is no illegality for placing the Roster point Promotees in the seniority at the appropriate places by applying catch up rule as per judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ajit Singh Janjua, and Govt. notification dated 22.10.1999. As per Govt. Instructions dated 22.10.1999 Roster point promotees (Reserved Category) cannot claim their seniority in the promoted Category from the date of their continues officiation in the promoted post, vis-à-vis the general candidates who were senior to them in the lower Category and who were later promoted, On the other hand , the senior general candidate at the lower level if he reached the promotion level later but before the further promotion of the reserve candidate, he will have to be treated as senior, at the promotional level to the reserved candidate even if the reserved candidate was earlier promoted to that level (Para 76 of Ajit Singh -II). Hence, the objection is ignored.
- d. Vide executive instructions No.3/34/99-3PP1/17646 dated 15.12.2005 the consequential seniority on roster promotion was ordered prospectively with effect from 17.11.2005 in the following manner:-

“After the careful consideration of the matter and also keeping in view the interim orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court and the present status of the case pending in the Apex court, it has been decided that scheduled caste employees promoted to any class or classes of posts under the reservation policy, will be prospectively entitled to “consequential seniority” on the post to which they are promoted.

These instructions shall come into force w.e.f. 17th November, 2005 and shall be applicable to the posts falling vacant in future in all cadres. They are also subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in I A No. 2 in writ petition (Civil) No. 61/2002-M.Nagraj and others V/s Union of India and others and writ petition (Civil) No. 234/2002-All India Equality Form and others V/s Union of India and others and other allied cases.”

These instructions were considered in CWP No. 1960 of 2008- Pritpal Singh v/s State of Punjab and it was decided by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana high Court that the reservation act 2006 does not contain any provision for consequential seniority. Govt. Instructions dated 15.12.05 and Govt. circular dated 4.5.1974 has been quashed. SLPs filed by Govt. of Punjab and Sh. Tara Singh belonging to reserve Category have been dismissed on 13.5.2010 and 16.11.10 respectively. The decision of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 9.9.2009 in the case of Pritpal Singh is based on the final decision of M. Nagraj & Others in Civil Wirt Petition No. 61/2002 dated 19.10.2006. CWP No. 16733 of 2006(O&M) decided on 01.04.2011 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others wherein the petitioner seeking of implementation of the 85th Constitutional amendment. The same has been dismissed on the plea that State has not enacted or made any provision for grant of consequential seniority to roster promotees as mandated by Article 16(4A). However, this judgment has also been referred to the reporter. Hence,

the objection is ignored.

- e. The Seniority has been prepared in accordance with the Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 and provision of the Punjab Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes (Reservations in Services) Act-2006 has been complied with. Hence, the objection is ignored.
- f. Though the official belongs from General Category promoted later in the next rank but they are senior to officials of Reserve Category in the feeder cadre i.e. Constable.

Therefore, these officials have regained their seniority as per Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 & their names have been rightly placed above the officials belonging to reserve categories. Hence, the objection is ignored.

- g. The Hon'ble Supreme Court concluded in the case of M. Nagraj and Others V/s Union of India on 19.10.2006 as under:-

The impugned constitutional amendments by which Articles (16 (4A) and 16 (4B) have been inserted flow from article 16 (4). They do not alter the structure of Article 16 (4). They retain the controlling factors or the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness and inadequacy of representation which enables the States to provide for reservation keeping in mind the overall efficiency of the State administration under Article 335. these impugned amendments are confined only to SCs and STs. They do not obliterate any of the constitutional requirements, namely, ceiling-limit of 50% (quantitative limitations), the sub-classification between OBC on one hand and SCs and STs on the other hand as held in Indra Sawhney, the concept of post-based Roster with in-built concept of replacement as held in R.K Sabharwal.

We reiterate that the ceiling-limit of 50% the concept of creamy layer and the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency are all constitutional requirements without which the structure of equality of opportunity in Article 16 would collapse.

However, in this case, as stated, the main issue concerns the "extent of reservation". In this regard the concerned State will have to show in each case the existence of the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency before making provision for reservation. As stated above, the impugned provision is an enabling provision. The State is not bound to make reservation for SC/ST in matter of promotions. However if they wish to exercise their discretion and make such provision, the State has to collect quantifiable data showing backwardness of the class and inadequacy of representation of that class in public employment in addition to compliance of Article 335. It is made clear that even if the State has compelling reasons, as stated above, the State will have to see that its reservation provision does not lead to excessiveness so as to breach the ceiling-limit of 50% of obliterate the creamy layer or extend the reservation indefinitely.

Subject to above, we uphold the constitutional validity of the constitution (Seventy-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1995, the Constitution (Eighty-First Amendment) Act, 2000, The constitution (Eighty-Second Amendment) Act, 2000 and the Constitution (Eighty-Fifth Amendment Act, 2000."

From the above decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is clear that provision for reservation in the matter of promotion with consequential seniority to any class is only an enabling provision. Hence the objection is ignored.

An opportunity of personal hearing has also been granted to ASI Ved Parkash No. 929/W who have opted for the same. He was called for hearing on before the seniority committee on 26.04.11. But ASI Ved Parkash No. 929/W had not reported on 26.4.11 so he was called again on 3.5.2011 and during the hearing following points has been raised by him.

➤ Stated the seniority should be fixed in accordance with the recent judgement of Hon'ble High Court in the CWP No 16733 of 2006 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others decided on 01.04.2011. A copy of the judgement has also produced by him at the time of hearing.

ASI Ved Parkesh 929/W stated the seniority should be fixed in accordance with the recent judgement of Hon'ble High Court in the CWP No 16733 of 2006 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others decided on 01.04.2011. A copy of the judgement has also produced by him at the time of hearing.

This judgement has been considered while finalization of the seniority.

All the pleas raised by the officials in their representations have been considered objectively keeping in view the Judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of R.K. Sabharwal, Ajit Singh Janjua and writ petition (Civil) No. 61 of 2002 M.Nagraj V/s Union of India and others. The Judgement of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1960 of 2008 and CWP No. 16733 of 2006 decided on 01.04.2011. Some other parameters taken for the finalization of the seniority are mentioned below:-

- The Punjab Schedule Castes and Backward Classes (Reservation in Services) Act, 2006.
- Punjab Govt. instructions issued vide no. 3/34/99/3-PPI/12565, dated 22.10.1999.
- On the basis of their date of promotion, enlistment and inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing in the year 1978.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable/ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 1991.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978 & 1991, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable / ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 2008.

All the clerical mistakes which are brought in the notice by the representationists have been corrected in the Final Seniority list, on the basis of record available in this office.

No other material illegality irregularity or discrepancies but so ever have been pointed in the tentative seniority list. Accordingly representations submitted by the officials of this wing are disposed off and the seniority list is finalized. However, the seniority is subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWPs No. 15365/1998, 2228/2000, 12086/2008, 12586/2008 & 13099/2008 and other court cases.

However, the Government reserves the right to revise the same in case of any administrative exigencies arising out of any judicial pronouncement.

A copy of the final seniority list is enclosed herewith.

This be brought to the notice of all the concerned.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

No. 17618-71 /E-1 Dated:Chandigarh the: 11.05.11

A copy of the above is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action within stipulated period, please acknowledge receipt.

23. Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh.
24. Director General of Police, Vigilance Bureau Punjab, Chandigarh.

25. Addl. Director General of Police, Intelligence, Punjab, Chandigarh.
26. O/o the Addl. Director General of Police Information Technology & Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
27. The Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication Punjab Chandigarh.
28. I/C CM Security Punjab, Chandigarh.
29. All Dy. Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
30. All SDCs in Punjab.
31. I/C IT Stations Bahadurgarh, Jahan Khelan, Phillaur, PAP Jalandhar, Ladda Kothi, Kasauli And Sri Naina Devi Ji (HP)
32. Training Inspector (wireless) PPA Phillaur.
33. MI, CI, I/C Cipher Cell, Inspr. Technical Stores, Inspr. HQRs. RI Police lines IT&T Mohali & Supdt./E, Supdt./ Acct. Supdt./Mod.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

Office of the Addl. Director General of Police, Information Technology & Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.

No.17672/E-1

Dated Chandigarh, the 11.05.11

Subject:- Final Seniority List of Head Constables Operators of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing.

This is continuation to this office order No.1854-1918/E-1 dated 21.1.2011 on the subject cited above.

The tentative Seniority lists of Head Constables (Operator) of Punjab Police Telecommunication Wing was prepared on 20.1.2011 and circulated vide dated 21.1.2011. A period of 21 days was afforded to the concerned persons for filing objections, if any.

Inadvertently, it could not be mentioned in the circular letter that only reserve points are to be determined by the Committee (Therefore, the objections have also been submitted raising the other points relating to inter-se-seniority of the promotees as well as probationers, application of Punjab Police Act, 2007, confirmation etc.). In fact the Committee has been constituted for determining the reserve points and further promotions. Since the Committee is only determining the reserve points, therefore, the Committee is not considering the other objections of the personnel for their seniority & further promotions.

Representations of Head Constables (Operators) of General Category & Reserve Category

No objection has been raised by this category regarding the reserve points.

Objections raised by Head Constables (Operators) Reserve Category

- a. That the service of the officials are being governed under the PPR-1934 as special law therefore the service of applicant does not governed under the C.S.R for the appointment and condition of service.
- b. That the Promotion for one rank to other rank are made as per chapter 13 of PPR-1934.
- c. That the final seniority list issued in the year of 2009 was finalized after hearing objection and representation from the concerned and cannot be reopened as per law led down in “ Malcom Lawrence Cecil D’Souza versus union of India and others” AIR 1975 S.C 1269 and “ Vinod Kumar Gupta versus State of Haryana and others “ 2007 (2) RSJ 454 (D.B.)
- d. That the Seniority list prepared on 20.1.2011 after implementation the Ajit Singh Janjua which is not in vogue in any of the office Punjab Govt. as per Govt. instruction issued vide letter dated 15.12.05 for implementation of 85th amendment of constitution of India.
- e. That the D.O letter vide No. 1 / 23 / 09 / RS1 / 914-933 dated 9.7.09 from Chief Secy. Punjab for the implementation of Punjab SC/BC reservation act 2006 not considered while preparing the tentative seniority list
- f. That the Head Constables belonging to reserve Category raised common objections that the officials belonging to General Category are junior to them as they are promoted earlier to them.
- g. Articles 16(4A) of the Constitution of India 1950 empowers the state from making any provision for reservation in matter of promotion, with consequential seniority to any class.

Their Objections have been considered & decided as follows:

- a. The services of the officials are being governed under the PPR-1934 as well as Punjab C.S.R.
- b. This issue has already been decided by the high power committee constituted by DGP Punjab under the chairmanship of Sh. Kuldeep Singh IPS and others in year 2008. Hence, the objection is ignored
- c. The judgment so quoted in the in the Para did not debar the department for

correcting the wrong/irregularities which has put majority of the officials of general Category to gross disadvantages. There is no illegality for placing the Roster point Promotees in the seniority at the appropriate places by applying catch up rule as per judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ajit Singh Janjua, and Govt. notification dated 22.10.1999. As per Govt. Instructions dated 22.10.1999 Roster point promotees (Reserved Category) cannot claim their seniority in the promoted Category from the date of their continues officiation in the promoted post, vis-à-vis the general candidates who were senior to them in the lower Category and who were later promoted, On the other hand , the senior general candidate at the lower level if he reached the promotion level later but before the further promotion of the reserve candidate, he will have to be treated as senior, at the promotional level to the reserved candidate even if the reserved candidate was earlier promoted to that level (Para 76 of Ajit Singh -II). Hence, the objection is ignored.

- d. Vide executive instructions No.3/34/99-3PP1/17646 dated 15.12.2005 the consequential seniority on roster promotion was ordered prospectively with effect from 17.11.2005 in the following manner:-

“After the careful consideration of the matter and also keeping in view the interim orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court and the present status of the case pending in the Apex court, it has been decided that scheduled caste employees promoted to any class or classes of posts under the reservation policy, will be prospectively entitled to “consequential seniority” on the post to which they are promoted.

These instructions shall come into force w.e.f. 17th November, 2005 and shall be applicable to the posts falling vacant in future in all cadres. They are also subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in I A No. 2 in writ petition (Civil) No. 61/2002-M.Nagraj and others V/s Union of India and others and writ petition (Civil) No. 234/2002-All India Equality Form and others V/s Union of India and others and other allied cases.”

These instructions were considered in CWP No. 1960 of 2008- Pritpal Singh v/s State of Punjab and it was decided by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana high Court that the reservation act 2006 does not contain any provision for consequential seniority. Govt. Instructions dated 15.12.05 and Govt. circular dated 4.5.1974 has been quashed. SLPs filed by Govt. of Punjab and Sh. Tara Singh belonging to reserve Category have been dismissed on 13.5.2010 and 16.11.10 respectively. The decision of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 9.9.2009 in the case of Pritpal Singh is based on the final decision of M. Nagraj & Others in Civil Wirt Petition No. 61/2002 dated 19.10.2006. CWP No. 16733 of 2006(O&M) decided on 01.04.2011 titled as Hari Singh V/s State of Punjab & others wherein the petitioner seeking of implementation of the 85th Constitutional amendment. The same has been dismissed on the plea that State has not enacted or made any provision for grant of consequential seniority to roster promotees as mandated by Article 16(4A). However, this judgment has also been referred to the reporter. Hence, the objection is ignored.

- e. The Seniority has been prepared in accordance with the Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 and provision of the Punjab Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes (Reservations in Services) Act-2006 has been complied with. Hence, the objection is ignored.
- f. Though the official belongs from General Category promoted later in the next rank but they are senior to officials of Reserve Category in the feeder cadre i.e. Constable.

Therefore, these officials have regained their seniority as per Govt. instructions dated 22.10.1999 & their names have been rightly placed above the officials belonging to reserve categories. Hence, the objection is ignored.

- g. The Hon'ble Supreme Court concluded in the case of M. Nagraj and Others V/s Union of India on 19.10.2006 as under:-

The impugned constitutional amendments by which Articles (16 (4A)

and 16 (4B) have been inserted flow from article 16 (4). They do not alter the structure of Article 16 (4). They retain the controlling factors or the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness and inadequacy of representation which enables the States to provide for reservation keeping in mind the overall efficiency of the State administration under Article 335. These impugned amendments are confined only to SCs and STs. They do not obliterate any of the constitutional requirements, namely, ceiling-limit of 50 % (quantitative limitations), the sub-classification between OBC on one hand and SCs and STs on the other hand as held in Indra Sawhney, the concept of post-based Roster with in-built concept of replacement as held in R.K Sabharwal.

We reiterate that the ceiling-limit of 50% the concept of creamy layer and the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency are all constitutional requirements without which the structure of equality of opportunity in Article 16 would collapse.

However, in this case, as stated, the main issue concerns the “Extent of reservation”. In this regard the concerned State will have to show in each case the existence of the compelling reasons, namely, backwardness, inadequacy of representation and overall administrative efficiency before making provision for reservation. As stated above, the impugned provision is an enabling provision. The State is not bound to make reservation for SC/ST in matter of promotions. However if they wish to exercise their discretion and make such provision, the State has to collect quantifiable data showing backwardness of the class and inadequacy of representation of that class in public employment in addition to compliance of Article 335. It is made clear that even if the State has compelling reasons, as stated above, the State will have to see that its reservation provision does not lead to excessiveness so as to breach the ceiling –limit of 50% of obliterate the creamy layer or extend the reservation indefinitely.

Subject to above, we uphold the constitutional validity of the constitution (Seventy-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1995, the Constitution (Eighty-First Amendment) Act 2000, The constitution (Eighty-Second Amendment) Act, 2000 and the Constitution (Eighty-Fifth Amendment Act, 2001....”

From the above decision of Hon’ble Supreme Court, it is clear that provision for reservation in the matter of promotion with consequential seniority to any class is only an enabling provision. Hence the objection is ignored.

An opportunity of personal hearing has been granted to the officials who opted for the same. HC Surinder Pal No. 2268/W and HC Subash Singh No. 2061/W were called for appearance before seniority committee on 26.04.2011.

During the personal hearing on 26.04.11. **HC Surinder Pal Singh 2268/W & Subash Singh 2061/W** Stated that they were promoted in C-II quota of 10% under Rule 13.8(2) of PPR and their seniority should be determined in accordance to their 10% quota as per sequence of promotion order.

The point raised by the above officials has been settled and their seniority determine to their 10% quota as per sequence of promotion order and settled accordingly.

All the pleas raised by the officials in their representations have been considered objectively keeping in view the Judgments of Hon’ble Supreme Court in the cases of R.K. Sabharwal, Ajit Singh Janjua and writ petition (Civil) No. 61 of 2002 M.Nagraj V/s Union of India and others. The Judgement of Hon’ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1960 of 2008 and CWP No. 16733 of 2006 decided

on 01.04.2011. Some other parameters taken for the finalization of the seniority are mentioned below:-

- The Punjab Schedule Castes and Backward Classes (Reservation in Services) Act, 2006.
- Punjab Govt. instructions issued vide no. 3/34/99/3-PPI/12565, dated 22.10.1999.
- On the basis of their date of promotion, enlistment and inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing in the year 1978.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable/ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 1991.
- The Officials who are not placed (projected) in the seniority list of 1978 & 1991, their promotion, enlistment & inter-se-seniority in the rank of Constable / ASI (Probationers) which was circulated by the Telecommunication Wing Year 2008.
- C-II Promotees Head Constables have been considered in the Head Constable seniority on the basis of their merit list of C-II.

All the clerical mistakes which are brought in the notice by the representationists have been corrected in the Final Seniority list, on the basis of record available in this office.

No other material illegality irregularity or discrepancies but so ever have been pointed in the tentative seniority list. Accordingly representations submitted by the officials of this wing are disposed off and the seniority list is finalized. However, the seniority is subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWPs No. 11241/1998 and other court cases.

However, the Government reserves the right to revise the same in case of any administrative exigencies arising out of any judicial pronouncement.

A copy of the final seniority list is enclosed herewith.

This be brought to the notice of all the concerned.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

No. 17673-726/E-1 Dated:Chandigarh the: 11.05.2011

A copy of the above is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action within stipulated period, please acknowledge receipt.

34. Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh.
35. Director General of Police, Vigilance Bureau Punjab, Chandigarh.
36. Addl. Director General of Police, Intelligence, Punjab, Chandigarh.
37. PA/ADGP/IT&T, Punjab, Chandigarh.
38. The Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication Punjab Chandigarh.
39. All Dy. Supdt. Of Police, Telecommunication, Punjab, Chandigarh.
40. All SDCs in Punjab.
41. I/C R/BGH, J/Khelan, PAP JALL, L/Kothi, KSL & Sri N/Devi Ji
42. Training Inspector (wireless) PPA Phillaur.
43. MI, CI, I/C Cipher Cell, Inspr. HQRs. RI Police lines IT&T Mohali & Supdt./E, Supdt./ Acct. Supdt./Mod.

Sd/-

For Addl. Director General of Police,
Information Technology & Telecommunication,
Punjab, Chandigarh.