GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
POLICE DEPARTMENT

PROCEEDINGS OF THE STATE POLICE CHIEF, KERALA,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PRESENT: K S BALASUBRAMANIAN I P S


Read: 1) Judgment dt.27.10.2006 in WP(C) 33353/03 of the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala
4) Govt. letter No.84705/H2/2010/Home dt.19.3.2011
5) Govt. letter No.35040/H2/2011/Home dt.10.6.2011
7) Judgment dt.1.9.2011 in WP(C) 22266/2011 of the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala
11) Representations/objections received from incumbents.
12) Govt. letter No.33122/H2/2013/Home dt.22.7.2013

ORDER No.M2/104015/2006 DT. 01/08/2013

In Police Department, Promotions to the cadre of U D Clerk are being made from the Seniority List of Test Qualified L D Clerks. This list being revised as and when the result of the obligatory departmental tests for promotion published by the Public Service Commission. In the lists, those appointed through PSC were assigned seniority w.e.f. the dates of their advice and those appointed under Compassionate Employment Scheme and otherwise were assigned seniority w.e.f. the date of Government order sanctioning their appointment. Challenging the seniority assigned w.e.f the dates of Government Orders, WP(C)33353/03 has been filed before the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala. As per the Judgment dt. 27.10.2006 in WP(C)33353/03, the Hon’ble High Court issued direction to the State Police Chief (Director General of Police) to consider the representations of the Petitioners therein and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law expeditiously.

02. The issue has been taken up with Government and Government have issued direction to revise the seniority of CES candidates w.e.f. the date of their
appointment order issued by the Appointing Authority as ordered in GO(P)19/91/P&ARD dt. 28.5.1991 as per the Government letters read as (2) to (5) above. Accordingly, the Provisional Combined Seniority list of Test qualified LD Clerks in Police Department from 1.5.1991 to 1.9.2007 has been published as per the PHQ No.M2/104015/2006 dt. 23.6.2011 read as (6) above.

03. Challenging this seniority list, WP(C) 22266/11 has been filed before the Hon’ble High Court. In compliance with the Judgment dt. 1.9.2011 in WP(C)22266/11 of the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala, the claims of the petitioners therein has been examined and rejected as per the order read as (8) above. As the seniority list of test qualified L D Clerks are being revised as and when the results of the departmental tests are published by PSC and promotions to the cadre of UD Clerks effected from the lists in existence at that time, the combined seniority list of Test Qualified LDCs from 1.5.1991 to 1.9.2007 was found as insufficient to settle the issue and hence the list has been cancelled and ordered to revise all the existing Seniority Lists of Test Qualified L D Clerks, wherein the LDCs appointed on or after 28.5.1991 are included, as per the order read as (8) above.

04. Though the Government Orders sanctioning appointments were issued maintaining seniority, appointment orders are seen issued without maintaining the seniority due to the issuance of appointment orders by various Appointing Authorities. This discrepancy has been taken up with Government and Government have issued clarification as per the letter read as (9) above that:-

"The seniority for getting appointment under the Compassionate Employment Scheme is to be fixed based on the date of valid application put in by an applicant. Appointment order is to be issued maintaining the seniority of application, as far as possible. In case any junior applicant is given appointment earlier than a senior applicant, the seniority of the senior applicant has to be restored. For this purpose, it has to be assumed that the senior applicant entered into service on the date on which the junior entered into service and his salary has to be fixed accordingly. But the monetary benefits will be available from the actual date of joining service”.

As such, seniors who got delayed appointment due to no fault of theirs are assigned seniority above their juniors w.e.f. the date of appointment order of such junior.

05. The L D Clerks who were appointed on or after 28.5.1991 have acquired test qualification only in the year 1994 and thereafter they were included in the Seniority List of Test Qualified LDCs as on 9.9.1994 onwards. Such LDCs got promotion as UDCs from the Seniority List of Test Qualified LDCs as on 23.4.2001 onwards. However, the Seniority Lists of Test Qualified L D Clerks as on 9.9.1994 onwards up to 28.10.2010 (32 Lists) have been revised.

06. Promotions as UDCs were made in accordance with the seniority in the Seniority List of Test Qualified LDCs then existed. Those get seniority in the revised list above to those promoted earlier to them from the then existing list as on that date are entitled for notional promotion w.e.f. the date of promotion of such junior in the revised list.

07. The revised provisional Seniority lists (32 Nos.) were published as per the PHQ order read as (10) above in the official web site of Kerala Police
on 22.11.2012 for information of all concerned and requested to submit objections, if any, against the lists within 15 days from the date of publication.

08. Representations/Objections in this regard received from the unit officers and incumbents till date have been examined and disposed of as detailed below.

1. IGP, TVM Range vide Letter No.A5-4193/12TR Dtd. 3.12.12 has requested to include the names of 3 LDCs (J. Noushad, Sujith K.S, K. Mahesh Kumar), who acquired test qualification in 9/2012, in the list also.
   
   The list of Test qualified LDCs up to 28.10.2010 are published and hence the Clerks qualified in 9/2012 are not included therein.

2. Sri. B.Remeshkumar, JS, EKM Range Office has requested to revise the seniority of those appointed prior to 28.5.1991 also.

   Orders regarding seniority of candidates appointed under CES will be with effect from the date of appointment order of the appointing authority has been issued in the GO (P) No.19/91/P&ARD Dt. 28.5.1991. Hence this order cannot be made applicable prior to that date.

3. The following incumbents have requested correction of entries in the lists such as PSC advice No. and date, Govt. Order No. and date, Appointment order No. and date, date of Birth, Date of joining duty, initials and spellings in name etc.

   1. T.J. Kuriakose, Cashier, KAP1 Bn
   2. Manikandan V.S. UDC KAP1 Bn
   3. Suhara Beevi.A UDC PHQ
   4. Sindhu. M.S. UDC EKM RI
   5. P.V. Raji UDC CPO Kochi
   6. M. Manoj Kumar, UDC CPO Kochi
   7. D.N. Venugopalakrishna Bhatt UDC CPO Kochi
   8. K.S. Jothish, UDC CPO Kochi
   9. Fousia P Asis, UDC CPO Kochi
   10. Ambili C.V. UDC CPO Kochi
   11. Anitha Sundaran UDC CPO Kochi
   12. Asha S UDC CPO Kochi
   13. K.M. Rajiv UDC DPO TSR Rural
   14. Sunil Kumar Munnam Padiyan UDC MSP MPM
   15. N.Sreejamol UDC DPO KTM
   17. Shiji Raveendran LDC DPO IDK
   18. M. Krishna Gireesan UDC DPO MPM
   19. Maya Sukumaran, UDC KAP4 Bn
   20. Maya M. UDC KAP4 Bn
   21. Rejila.P.K. UDC KAP4 Bn
   22. K.K.Shylaja, UDC, KAP4 Bn
   23. P.M.Gafoor UDC CPO KKD
   24. K.S. Geethamma UDC DPO ALP
   25. K.K. Sureshkumar UDC DPO PTA
   26. S.Sheeba UDC FPB TVM
   27. Kumari Manju S. UDC PHQ
28. Bindu V.C. UDC PHQ
29. M. Abbas UDC DPO WYD
30. Rethi Gopinath UDC DPO TSR Rural
31. Anvar A.P. UDC SCRBR

Their representations have been examined in detail with reference to the relevant records and appropriate corrections made in the Annexure III to Annexure XXXII Lists.

4. The following incumbents have requested to re-assign their seniority taking into account the date of birth, date of joining etc.
   1. Jilo M George UDC EKM Rural
   2. Santhosh V S UDC DPO MPM
   3. Geetha K UDC PHQ

   Their requests are for re-assigning seniority from among those appointed in the same advice lists. There is no provision to alter the seniority of candidate noted in the same PSC advice list and hence their requests are rejected.

5. C.Kalimuthu UDC DPO PKD and V. Gigimol LDC DPO IDK have requested to re-assign their seniority in accordance with the PSC Advice letter.

   Their requests have been examined and re-assigned their seniority in accordance with the seniority in the PSC Advice letter, in Annexure XIX, XXXI and XXXII Lists.

6. K.Sureshkumar, UDC DPO PKD has requested to include his name in the Annexure XVII list as on 4.4.2003.

   He had acquired test qualification in 1/2006 only and accordingly included in the Annexure XXIII List as on 30.6.2006. His request for inclusion of his name in the Seniority List of Test qualified LD Clerks prior to his acquisition of test qualification is rejected.

7. U.Rajeev Kumar, UDC, DPO, PTA has requested to re-fix the inter-se-seniority of incumbents advised on 6.11.2001 from different DRBs.

   Verified and corrected the inter-se-seniority of persons advised on 6.11.2001 from different DRBs as per Rule 27(b) Part II KS &SSRs in the annexure XIX to XXIV lists.

8. John James, UDC, PHQ has request to include his name in the list as on 24.10.09 as he had passed the departmental test in 7/09 and promoted as UDC vide DGO 337/10 dated 21.4.10.

   Verified and included his name in the annexure XXX list.

9. H.Jayakumar and K.G.Sunayana, UDCs, DPO, ALP have requested to exclude their names from the annexure XXXI and XXXII lists as they were promoted as UDCs based on the Annexure XXX list.

   Their requests have been examined. The names of all incumbents who have been promoted as UD Clerks from Annexure XXX list are deleted from the Annexure XXXI and XXXII lists.

10. G.Sreekumar, UDC, DPO, Kollam Rural has requested to note the LWA period from 7.11.08 to 1.8.2010 in respect of Praveenlal, UDC.
Verified and noted the details in Annexure XXXI list.

11. S.Jomon, UDC, PTA and Suresh G.Krishnan, UDC, PHQ have requested to change their options for posting as UDCs in the list.

**There is no provision to change the option after accepting promotion and hence their requests are rejected.**

12. S.Udayakumaran Nair, UDC, PTC has requested to place him as senior to L.Samson in Annexure XX list.

He had acquired test qualification in 11/05 and hence his name included in Annexure XXII list as on 2.11.05. In the list, L.Samson is junior to him. His request for placing his name in the list prior to the date of his test qualification is rejected.

13. Suresh G Krishnan, UDC, PHQ and Anvar.A.P, UDC, SCRIB are requested to delete the name of E.K.Sreevivasan from Annexure XVII list and also note that Manoj.D.Nair is not in service.

The details have been verified and appropriate corrections made in the lists concerned.

14. A.N.Santha Kumari, UDC, CPO, Kochi has requested to re-fix her place above Smt.A.Zeena, UDC applying date of birth seniority.

**Both Zeena and A.N.Santha Kumari are sanctioned appointment under Sports Quota in the same Government Order. Zeena is senior to Santha Kumari in the GO and in the Appointment Order. But Smt.A.Zeena was on LWA for study purpose from 22.11.1993 to 31.05.1994 before completion of probation under Appendix XII B, Part I KSRs as per GO(Rt)No.2678/93/Home dtd 26.11.1993 and re-joined on 1.6.94. Hence she is entitled for seniority w.e.f 1.6.94 and her seniority is re-fixed accordingly.**

15. A.S.Pushpikala, UDC, CPO, TVM has represented that she is shown as junior to Unnikrishnan in the lists and requested to correct the same.

**A.S.Pushpikala has already been placed as senior to Unnikrishnan in the list, as such his complaint is found as vague and hence rejected.**

16. Premlal.P.L UDC PHQ, Mohammed Sadiq.K.P UDC RRRF, Bindu.T UDC KAP 4 and Rekha D Nair UDC PHQ, who have been appointed under CES, have represented against the protection of seniority of CES hands and requested to re-fix their seniority according to date of birth, appointment order and date of joining etc.

**Both the petitioners and the incumbents specified them are appointed under CES. In the earlier lists, the seniority of CES hands were fixed w.e.f the date of seniority of Government Order, though they got appointment in different dates. Now the seniority of CES hands are re-fixed w.e.f the date of appointment Order of appointing authority as ordered in the GO(P)19/91/P&ARD dtd 28.5.1991. To avoid loss of seniority of seniors in Government Orders due to the issuance of delayed appointment orders, Government have issued clarification as per the letter read as (9) above that “in case of any junior applicant is given appointment earlier than a senior applicant, the seniority of the senior applicant has to be restored”. The CES hands place as seniors to them**
are actually seniors but got delayed appointment due to no fault of theirs. Hence their requests are rejected.

17. Smt.M.K.Ayisha, UDC, TSR Rural has represented that she senior to P.B.Manoj, who applied under CES on the same date, according to date of birth; and also senior to Justin Jose and others according to date of application and hence requested to re-fix her seniority above to them.

The CES application date of P B Manoj and M K Ayisha are same (5.5.1993) and P B Manoj is senior to M.K.Ayisha in Government Order. There is no provision to re-arrange the seniority of persons appointed through various Government Orders according to date of birth and hence her claim for seniority above P.B.Manoj is rejected. But she is found as senior to Justin Jose and others according to date of CES application and hence her seniority re-fixed accordingly as per the letter read as (9) above.

18. Objections of the following incumbents are categorized in common as detailed below:

\[ \text{a) PSC hands against CES and Sports hands} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of incumbents</th>
<th>Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.C.V.Jagannathan, UDC, DPO, PTA</td>
<td>1. CES hands appointed and joined service after their advice are placed as seniors to them is against Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.V.K.Balakrishnan, UDC, DPO, KKD RI</td>
<td>2. In the case of appointment under Sports quota the incumbents are appointed in supernumerary posts on contract basis. After the contract period they may be appointed against a regular vacancy in the department. Their seniority will be reckoned w.e.f the date on which their appointment is regularized against the regular vacancy in the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Suresh G Krishnan, UDC, PHQ</td>
<td>3. The date of appointment order of the sports hands taken for protection of seniority of three persons appointed under CES is not correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Anilakshan Kayyil, UDC, DPO, KKD RI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Anvar.A.P, UDC, SCRB, Tvpn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Geetha G, UDC, PHQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the personal hearing conducted by ADGP (Admn) on 22.1.2013 Suresh G Krishnan and G.Geetha, UDCs of PHQ have raised the following objections also and submitted the same in written statement on 31.1.2013.

(a) The CES hands are entitled for seniority w.e.f the date of appointment order only and their seniority has been fixed correctly in the lists published vide PHQ order No.M2/104015/2006 dtd 3.7.2010 and 23.6.2011.

(b) Only 5% of the vacancy is reserved for CES hands as per GO(P)No.12/1999/P&ARD dated 24.5.1999. The delay in issuing appointment orders was occurred during the years of 1995, 1996 etc is due to the appointment of CES hands over and above the stipulated 5% reservation. This fact has been suppressed in the PHQ letter No.M2/104015/2006 dtd 16.2.2012 addressed to the Government seeking clarification regarding seniority of CES hands.

(c) In a seniority list of LDCs appointed under various methods such as PSC, CES, Sports Quota, PH Quota etc.,
b) **CES hands against PSC hands & Revision of seniority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of incumbents</th>
<th>Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. P.M. George Roy, UDC, CPO, Kochi</td>
<td>1. Government Orders sanctioning appointment under CES in this department are issued only after reporting vacancy as in the case of PSC hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justin M Thomas, UDC, CPO, Kochi</td>
<td>2. The CES hands were assigned seniority w.e.f the date of Government Order in earlier seniority lists and given promotion accordingly. Changing their settled seniority in the entry post and promoted posts after a long period is against rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jude Thadeus K.X, UDC, CPO, Kochi</td>
<td>3. They are not in parties in the WP(C)33353/2003 and hence the Judgment and the revision is not bound to them. Besides there is no direction in the judgment to revise the settled seniority and to revise the seniority lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sheeba S Nair, UDC, CPO, Typm</td>
<td>4. The Government Orders sanctioning their appointment under CES are seen kept idle in PHQ and thereafter the vacancies are reported to PSC and the PSC hands appointed. This is a clear violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sunil Kumar T.S, UDC, CPO, Typm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bindhu J.P, UDC, Typm City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gopika G, UDC, Typm City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vasanthy Devi S, UDC, Typm City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Leena K, UDC, Typm City (Deputation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A.V. Manju, UDC, SAP, Typm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. C. Suresh Kumar, UDC, DPO, PTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. P. Shamnad, UDC, Tele, Tvm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c) Sports hands against CES hands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of incumbents</th>
<th>Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Annie Mathew, UDC, PHQ</td>
<td>1. Five persons appointed under CES and placed as juniors to them in the earlier lists are placed as seniors, is not correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sheeba Mathew, UDC, CPO, KKD</td>
<td>In the personal hearing conducted by ADGP (Admn) on 22.1.2013 Annie Mathew, UDC has raised the following objections also and submitted written statement on 31.01.2013. (a) Sports hands are appointed under Supernumerary posts and hence they are appointed to service without waiting for vacancy and entitled for seniority accordingly. But the CES hands are waiting for vacancy in the 5% quota for appointment and hence entitled for seniority w.e.f that date only. (b) CES hands are appointed over and above the 5% quota in the years 1994, 1995 and 1996. This action is not justifiable and hence the seniority assigned them has to be revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objections (a), (b) & (c) above are considered together and revealed as follows:

1. The methods of appointment as LDCs in Police Department are under PSC advice, Government Orders for CES, Sports and other Special Categories, PH appointments by District Collectors, Inter Departmental transfers etc. PSC hands were assigned seniority w.e.f the date of PSC advice and others from the date of Government Order etc. Based on the directions contained in the judgment dated 27.10.2006 in WP(C)33353/03 of the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala the issue regarding fixation of seniority of CES hands has been taken up with Government. As per the Government letters read as 2 to 5 above, Government have issued clarification to revise the seniority of CES hands w.e.f the date of their appointment orders issued by the appointing authorities as specified in the GO(P) No.19/91/P&ARD dtd 28.5.91, and accordingly revision of the seniority lists become necessitated.

2. In the revised seniority lists the PSC hands are allowed seniority w.e.f date of their PSC advice as per rules and as reiterated in the Government clarifications read as (2) to (5) above and no alteration in this case has been made.

3. The argument of the PSC hands that they are seniors to the CES hands pointed out by them in all the previous lists is not correct. The lists said to have been published on 3.7.2010 and 23.6.2011 are cancelled and not in existence.

4. The argument that only 5% vacancy is reserved for CES hands as per GO(P) 12/1999/P&ARD dtd 24/5/1999 is not correct. It has been ordered in Para 30 of the GO that appointment of dependents in general category posts such as LDC, LDT, Peons etc will be made in the concerned department itself against an existing or arising vacancy. It has also been ordered in Para 33 and 34 of the GO that if none of the alternatives mentioned in paras 30 to 32 is possible such cases shall be referred to Genl Admn (CE Cell) Department for allotment of 5% vacancies. The CES hands, whose Seniority now challenged by the PSC hands are the dependents of Government Servants died in harness while working in Police Department. Hence insisting of 5% quota is not applicable to them.

5. It is not found that the Government Orders sanctioning appointments under CES in the department were issued without vacancy and also the Government Orders were kept pending for awaiting vacancy for appointment. It is also evident that juniors in Government Order get earlier appointment than their seniors in Government Orders and to protect the seniority of seniors Government have issued clarification as per the letter read as (8) above.

6. The specific objection of Suresh G Krishnan that the CES hands, Sl Nos.41 to 48 in Annexure XVIII, are placed senior to him against natural justice and the delay in issuing appointment Order to them was occurred due to the appointment of CES hands over and above the 5% reservation has been examined.

The 5% quota is not applicable to the CES hands, Sl Nos.41 to 48 in Annexure XVIII, since all of them are the dependents of Government Servants died in harness while working in Police Department. Sl. No.50 in Annexure XVIII was junior to Sl. Nos. 41 to 49 but got earlier
appointment. Hence their seniority restored and fixed above the junior as clarified in the Government letter read as (9) above.

7. The specific objection of Geetha is that 4 CES hands (Sl. Nos.16, 18, 19 & 20 in Annexure XVIII) appointed after her date of advice are assigned seniority above to her; and the specific objection of Annie Mathew is that 5 CES hands (Sl. Nos.14, 16, 18, 19 &20 in Annexure XVIII) appointed after date of appointment assigned seniority above to her.

Sl. No.14 in Annexure XVIII is senior to Sl. No.15 appointed on 25.1.95 ie, prior to the date of appointment of Annie Mathew on 6.2.95. Sl. No.16 in Annexure XVIII is senior to Sl. No.17 appointed in 4.2.95 ie, prior to the date of advice of Geetha (5.3.95) and the date of appointment of Annie Mathew (6.2.95). The seniority of Sl. Nos.14 & 16 are restored w.e.f the date of their junior (Sl. Nos.15 &17) in CES as per the Government letter read as (9) above.

Regarding the seniority assigned to 3 CES hands (Sl. No.18, 19 & 20 in Annexure XVIII - Provisional) above Smt.Annie Mathew (Sports hand) (Sl. No.23 in Annexure XVIII - Provisional), Government have issued clarification as per the letter read as (12) above that “Appointments under Sports quota and Compassionate Employment Scheme are to be treated separately for the purpose of determining seniority”. Accordingly, seniority of the 3 CES hands (Sl. No.18, 19 & 20 in Annexure XVIII - Provisional) is fixed as Sl. Nos.25, 26 & 27 respectively in the Annexure XVIII and the seniority of Sports hands including Annie Mathew has been re-fixed accordingly.

09. In the circumstances, the provisional seniority lists are finalized with the modifications and corrections mentioned above and published herewith as Annexure Nos. I to XXXII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annexure</th>
<th>Seniority List of Test Qualified LDCs as on</th>
<th>Annexure</th>
<th>Seniority List of Test Qualified LDCs as on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5.5.1997</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>19.11.1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>13.5.1998</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>7.11.1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3.5.1999</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18.10.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>13.4.2000</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>June/July-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>23.4.2001</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>27.10.2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>30.5.2002</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>22.10.2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>4.4.2003</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>16.10.2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>2.4.2004</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>20.10.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>5.4.2005</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>2.11.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>30.6.2006</td>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>31.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>10.4.2007</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>24.10.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>11.4.2008</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>20.10.2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>7.4.2009</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>24.10.2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>29.4.2010</td>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>28.10.2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. The list is also available in the official web site of Kerala Police www.keralapolice.org for information of all concerned. The lists are published in compliance with the Judgment dtd. 27.10.2006 in WP(C) 33353/03 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. The lists will be subject to the disposal of the OA No.288/2012 before the Hon'ble Kerala Administrative Tribunal filed by the 1st and 4th petitioners in WP(C) 22266/11.

Sd/-

STATE POLICE CHIEF

"I am directed to convey the above orders of the State Police Chief"

R. Kanakarajan
Senior Superintendent

To
All Officers in List B (except SBCID) for necessary action. All are requested communicate the details among the ministerial staff working under them.

Copy to: All SSs and JSs in PHQ who will inform the details to the clerks.
Copy to: Manager, CAs to SPC, ADGP (Admn), IGP (HQ), AIG II
Copy to: SF