BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL BENCH AT NAINITAL

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Rajendra Singh

------ Acting Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. A.S.Rawat

-------Vice Chairman (A)

CLAIM PETITION NO. 43/NB/DB/2022

1. Abhay Kumar Singh (Male), Aged about 42 years, S/o Shri Tej Bahadur Singh, presently posted as Circle Officer City Rudrapur, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand.
2. Manoj Kumar Thakur, aged about 42 years, S/o Shri Hari Singh Presently posted as Deputy Superintendent of Police, Police Headquarter, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

……..Petitioners

Vs.

1. State of Uttarakhand through Additional Chief Secretary (Home), Government of Uttarakhand, Secretariat, Dehradun Uttarakhand.

2. Director General of Police, Uttarakhand, Dehradun.

3. Prakash Chandra Deoli, presently posted as Assistant Commandant, SDRF, Dehradun

4. Rakesh Chandra Deoli, presently posted as Chief Security Officer, Sachivalya, Dehradun

5. Vijendra Dutt Dobhal, presently posted as Assistant Commandant, 40 Battalion PAC, Haridwar.

6. Chakradhar Anthwal, presently posted as Deputy Superintendent of Police, Police Headquarters, Dehradun

7. Pankaj Gairola, presently posted as Circle Officer, Manglaur, Haridwar

……...Respondents

Present: Sri B.D.Upadhyay, Senior Advocate, assisted by
Sri Tushar Upadhyay, Advocate for the petitioners.
Sri Kishore Kumar, A.P.O. for the respondents no. 1 & 2

JUDGEMNT

DATED: OCTOBER 29, 2026

PER: HON'BLE SRI A.S.RAWAT, VICE CHAIRMAN(A)

Present claim petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioners for the following reliefs:

> *"1. To set aside the impugned seniority list dated 09.06.2022 and to restore the seniority list dated 10.05.2018.*
>
> *2. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case*.

2. Brief facts of the case are as under:

2.1 The selection process was initiated for the selection/appointment on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police for the selection year 2010-11 pursuant to the advertisement dated 11.03.2011.

2.2 The service conditions of the petitioners as well as private respondents no. 3 to 7 are governed by the Uttarakhand Police Service Rules, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as the Rules of 2009). Rule- 5 of the Rules of 2009 provides the source of recruitment on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police. According to which, there are two sources of recruitment i.e. 50% by direct recruitment through the selection made by the UPSC and 50% by way of promotion from the subordinate services of the department as provided in the Rules of 2009. Rule-3 of the Rules of 2009 defines the 'year of recruitment' according to which the recruitment year means the period commencing from 1st July to 30th June. Rule-26 of the Rules of 2009 provides that the seniority of the persons so appointed under the rules shall be determined in accordance with the Uttarakhand Government Servant Seniority Rules, 2002.

2.3 Pursuant to the selection process started in the year 2010-11, the petitioners were appointed through direct recruitment on 01-01-2015 on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police and the private respondents were promoted on the said post on 28.11.2014 meaning thereby that the recruitment on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police was made in one selection year that is the period commencing from 01.07.2014 to 30.06.2015. In a situation where the appointments are made from both modes of recruitments, their seniority is to be determined as per Rule 8 of the Uttarakhand Government Servants Seniority Rules, 2002. Rule- 22 of the Rules of 2009 provides that in case the recruitment is made from direct recruitment as well as promotion in a year of recruitment, in that case, selection list shall be prepared in which the names shall be arranged in accordance with the prescribed percentage of posts and the first name shall be of the person who was appointment on the post by way of promotion.

2.4 The respondent no.1 issued a seniority list on 10.05.2018 in which the names were placed in a cyclic order as provided in Rule-22 of Rules of 2009. The Seniority list dated 10.05.2018 issued by the respondent no.1 was challenged by Shri Rakesh Chandra Deoli, Vijender Dutt Dobhal and Shri Prakash Chandra Deoli by filing Claim Petitions No. 123/DB/2019, 139/DB/2019 & 140/DB/2019 before this Tribunal. These claim petitions were decided by this Tribunal vide judgment dated 27.10.2021 with an observation that it appears that the name of the petitioner in the claim petition appears to have been wrongly shown in the seniority list dated 10.05.2018 which requires re-consideration.

2.5 It is submitted that the Tribunal while deciding the claim petition has not considered the aim and object of Rule- 22 of Rules of 2009 as such the decision passed is per in curium. Pursuant to the Tribunal's decision dated 27.10.202, the respondent no.1 while reconsidering the matter issued a tentative list dated 17.05.2022

whereby objections were invited from the aggrieved persons, if any. The petitioners being aggrieved, submitted their objections against the tentative seniority list dated 17.05.2022 stating therein that the seniority list issued on 10.05.2018 is just and in accordance with law as such the same is liable to be maintained.

2.6 The petitioners have been appointed in the selection year against the vacancy of the year 2010-11. Proviso (ii) to Rule 8(3) of the above said rules states, "where appointments from any source fall short of the prescribed quota and appointment against such unfilled vacancies are made in subsequent year or years, the persons so appointed shall not get seniority of any earlier year but shall get the seniority of the year in which their appointments are made, so however, that their names shall be placed at the top followed by the names, in the cyclic order of the other appointees". From the above provision, it is clear that what arrangement has been made for vacancy of any previous year if filled in subsequent year or years. Accordingly, the petitioners should have been placed above the respondents in the seniority list, which has been ignored by Respondent No.1 while finalizing the seniority list dated 09.06.2022.

2.7 The respondent no.1 without considering the legal provisions as provided in the Rules of 2009 as well as in the Seniority Rules of 2002, issued the impugned Seniority list dated 09.0.-2022 is illegal, arbitrary and bad in law. Vide impugned seniority list, the private respondents were appointed on the post by way of promotion, have been put en-bloc above the persons appointed in the same selection year by direct recruitment. The impugned seniority list has been issued in utter disregard to the well settled norms of the seniority as such the same is not sustainable in law.

3. Earlier the Claim Petitions No.123/DB/2019, 139/DB/2019 and 140/DB/2019 were filed by Shri Rakesh Chandra Deoli, Vijender Dutt Dobhal and Shri Prakash Chandra Deoli respectively with the following reliefs:

> *"a. To issue order or direction to call for records and to set aside/quash the seniority list dated 10.05.2018 [covering letter dated 11.05.2018] (Annexure: A1) in which the petitioner has been shown in cyclic order with appointees of the year 2015-16.*
>
> *b. To issue order or direction directing the respondents to keep the petitioner at the top in the seniority list as per the proviso to rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules, 2002.*
>
> *c. To give any other relief that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.*

4. The above claim petitions were decided by this Tribunal vide common judgment and order dated 27.10.2021 with the following observations:

> *"34. According to the rule position and decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Court, which have been mentioned above, the petitioner appears to have a case on merits. He should have been placed above respondent No. 4. Other private respondents are admittedly below respondent no. 4. The official respondents should, accordingly, find out as to how the quota of promotees vis'a-vis direct recruits can be maintained specially when the vacancies since 2011 have not been filled up.*
>
> *35. Petitioner's name therefore, appears to have been wrongly shown in the seniority list dated 10.05.2018, which requires reconsideration.*
>
> *36. The Tribunal would have discussed the claim petition further, on merits, but only for the reason that the claim petition is barred by limitation, we are not discussing it further and dismissing the claim petition, as barred by limitation.*
>
> *37. It will be open to the Government to review/revise its own decision, if deemed appropriate, as per law."*

5. In view of the above observations made by this Tribunal, the respondent no. 1, issued the impugned seniority list dated 09.06.2022, which is under challenge in the present claim petition.

6. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the Tribunal while deciding the previous claim petitions has not considered the aim and object of Rule- 22 of Rules of 2009 as such

the decision passed is per in curium. Pursuant to the decision of the Tribunal dated 27.10.2021, respondent no.1 while reconsidering the matter issued a tentative list dated 17.05.2022 whereby objections were invited from the aggrieved persons, if any. The petitioners being aggrieved submitted their objections against the tentative seniority list dated 17.05.2022 stating therein that the seniority list issued on 10.05.2018 is just and in accordance with law as such the same is liable to be maintained. The respondent no.1 without considering the legal provisions as provided in the Rules of 2009 as well as in the Seniority Rules of 2002 issued the impugned Seniority list dated 09.06.2022 is illegal, arbitrary and bad in law. Vide impugned seniority list the private respondents were appointed on the post by way of promotion have been made in bloc senior to the persons who were appointed in the same recruitment year by way of direct recruitment. The impugned seniority list has been issued in utter disregard to the well settled norms of the seniority as such the same is not sustainable in law.

7. Learned A.P.O. has submitted that the answering respondent has rightly issued the seniority list dated 09.06.2022, amending the seniority of the personnel appearing from serial no. 94 to 114 in the seniority list dated 10.05.2018. The impugned seniority list has been prepared in view of the Proviso (ii) to Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002, whereas the earlier seniority list dated 10.05.2018 was prepared only in view of Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002. Since the respondent no. 3 to 5 have been appointed against the vacancies of the year 2013-14, therefore by giving them due benefit of proviso (ii) to Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002, their names have been placed at the top and thereafter the name of the petitioners and of respondent no. 6 & 7 who have been appointed against the vacancies of the year 2014-15 have been placed in the cyclic order. Thus, for the reasons stated above the impugned seniority list dated 09.06.2022 is legal and valid and deserves to be upheld.

8. Private respondents no. 3 & 6 did not appear despite sufficient service, hence, the Tribunal decided to proceed ex-parte against them vide order dated 03.05.2023. Earlier, rest private respondents no. 4, 5 & 7 appeared through advocate, who have also filed Counter Affidavit, but later on, they did not appear before the Tribunal to contest their case.

9. We have heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

10. Learned Counsel for the petitioners argued that the petitioners were appointed as DSP on 01.01.2015 against the vacancies of 2010-11, for which the advertisement was issued on 11.03.2011. The petitioners as well as private respondents are governed by the Uttarakhand Police Service Rules, 2009. Rule 5 of the Rules of 2009 provides that there are two sources of recruitment i.e. 50 % by direct recruitment through selection made by Uttarakhand Public Service Commission and 50% by way of promotion from subordinate, selection from the department as provided in aforesaid rules. The year of Recruitment year has been defined under Rule-3 (cha) of Rules of 2009. Rule 22 of the Rules of 2009 provides that in case appointment in a particular year is done by direct recruitment and promotion then a combined select list will be prepared in which names of the candidates will be taken from the concerned lists in a way that the prescribed percentage of the candidates is maintained. The first name in the list will be of the person selected by promotion. It also provides under Rule 23(2) of the Rules of 2009 that in case in any year, the appointments are to be made by promotion as well as by direct recruitment then the regular appointments will not be done till the selection by both the sources have been made and combined select list as per Rule 22 has not been prepared. Further, Rule 26(1) of the Rules of 2009 provides that the seniority of the persons appointed will be determined as per the Uttarakhand Govt. Servants Seniority rules, 2002. Rule 8(3) of the Uttarakhand Govt. Servants

Seniority rules, 2002 clearly lays down that where appointments are made both by promotion and direct recruitment on the result of selection in any one selection year the seniority of promotees vis-a-vis direct recruits shall be determined in a cyclic order the first being a promotee as far as may be, in accordance with the quota prescribed for the two sources. The Rule 8(3) reads as under:

> "8(3) Where appointments are made both by promotion and direct recruitment on the result of selection in any one selection year the seniority of promotees vis a vis direct recruits shall be determined in a cyclic order the first being a promote as far as may be, in accordance with the quota prescribed for the two sources.
>
> **Illustrations** – (1) Where the quota of promotees and direct recruits is in the proportion 1:1 the seniority shall be in the following order;
>
> First --------- Promotee
>
> Second ---------- Direct recruits and so on
>
> (2) Where the said quota is in the proportion of 1:3 the seniority shall be in the following order :-
>
> First -------- Promotee
>
> Second to fourth -------- Direct Recruits
>
> Fifth -------- Promotee
>
> Six to eight -------- Direct recruits and so on
>
> Provided that –
>
> (i) Where appointments from any source are made in excess of the prescribed quota, the persons appointed in excess of quota shall be pushed down, for seniority, to subsequent year in which there are vacancies in accordance with the quota.
>
> (ii) Where appointments from any source fall short of the prescribed quota an appointment against such unfilled vacancies are made in subsequent year or years, the persons so appointed shall not get seniority of any earlier year but shall get the seniority of the year in which their appointments are made, so however, that their names shall be placed at the top followed by the names, in the cyclic order of the other appointees;
>
> (iii) Where, in accordance with the service rules the unfilled vacancies from any source could, in the circumstances mentioned in the relevant service rules be filled from the other source and appointment in excess of quota are so may, the persons so appointed shall get the seniority of that very year as if they are appointed against the vacancies of their quota."

11. The seniority list dated 10.05.2018, which was challenged in claim petitions No.123/DB/2019, 139/DB/2019 and 140/DB/2019, has the names of the petitioners and the private respondents arranged in the cyclic order and it was prepared as per Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules, 2002. The claim petition was dismissed on the ground of limitation by this Tribunal, but the Tribunal has observed that when vacancies have not been filled since 2011, how the quota of direct recruitees and promotees can be maintained. But the department based on this observation of this Tribunal changed the seniority list and placed the private respondents above the petitioners and applied cyclic order with the respondents no. 6 & 7 and below who were selected against the vacancies of 2014-15. The selection year as mentioned in the seniority list of the private respondents is immaterial for determination of seniority as they were appointed on 28.11.2014 and their recruitment year is 2014-15 along with the other candidates who were appointed on the basis of promotion against the vacancies of 2014-15. The seniority has to be decided as per Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002, although a combined select list has not been prepared as provided in the Rules of 2009 and the persons of both the sources were appointed on different dates. Although, the persons from both the sources have not been appointed from the same select list but that does not undermine the spirit of Rules 22 and 23 of Rules of 2009. Since, the seniority of the petitioners and the respondents have not been determined as per Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002, the claim petition is liable to be allowed, and the seniority list dated 09.06.2022 (Annexure no. 1) is liable to be set aside and the seniority list dated 10.05.2018 is liable to be restored.

12. Learned A.P.O. argued that the petitioners and the private respondents have been appointed in the same recruitment year 01.07.2014 to 30.06.2015. The selection years of the promoted candidates are 2013-14 and 2014-15. The impugned seniority list has been issued after pursuing the documents on record and in consonance with the available rules and statute. However, it is to

submit that the impugned seniority list has been finalized after the decision dated 27.10.2021 of the Tribunal in the claim petitions no. 123/DB/2019, 139/DB/2019 and 140/DB/2019. Although the aforesaid claim petitions were dismissed on the ground of limitation and those were not decided on merits. However, this Tribunal made observations related to the merits of the case in the aforesaid order. The selection year of the petitioners is 2014-15 as submitted by them also. So, they cannot be given the benefit of provisions of Rule 8(2) of the Seniority Rules, 2002, but the respondents no. 3 to 5 have been promoted in 2014-15 against the vacancies of the year 2013-14 and the private respondents no. 6 and 7 have been promoted against the vacant post of the year 2014-15. The respondents no. 3 to 5 were in the service even in the year 2014-15 and they have been correctly placed above the petitioners in the impugned seniority list dated 09.06.2022 by amending the seniority list dated 10.05.2018 as the respondents no. 3 and 5 have been appointed against the vacancies of 2013-14, whereas, the respondents no. 6 & 7 have been appointed against the vacancies of 2014-15, so they have been placed in cyclic order in the seniority list with the petitioners. So, the impugned seniority list issued on 09.06.2022 is valid and is liable to be upheld and the claim petition is liable to be dismissed.

13. Based on the arguments of the parties and perusal of the record, it is observed that the petitioners and the private respondents were appointed on the post of DSP in the same recruitment year 2014-15 but on different dates. In fact, the respondents were appointed on 28.11.2014 and the petitioners on 01.01.2015. They are not appointed from the same select list. The petitioners and respondents are governed by the Uttarakhand Police Service Rules, 2009. The source of recruitment of the post of DSP is direct recruitment (50%) and by promotion from subordinate services of the department (50%) as per Rules of 2009. Rule 22 of the Rules of 2009 clearly provides that in case of recruitment from both the sources in a year, a combined select list of the candidates to be prepared and the names of the candidates

to be arranged based on the quota prescribed in the Rules. The first name of the person will be of the person appointed by way of promotion. Rule 23(2) even lays down that appointment will not be made till the recruitment from both the sources is complete and the combined select list is prepared. Here, in the instant case, the provisions of Uttarakhand Police Service Rules, 2009 have not been followed and the persons have been given appointment on 28.11.2014 and 01.01.2015 on different dates but their appointment is within the same recruitment year 2014-15. So, their seniority should be prepared as per Rule 8(3) of the Seniority Rules of 2002.

14. A similar matter regarding determination of *inter-se* seniority between promotees and direct recruitees in case of Assistant Engineers Minor Irrigation Department was decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital in Writ Petition (S/B) No. 190 of 2016 on 03.10.2017. In para-2 of the aforesaid judgment, Hon'ble High Court has referred the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jagdish Ch. Patnaik and others v. State of Orrisa and others (1998) 4 SCC, 456, in which the main controversy amongst the parties was whether the year for which the vacancies were notified is a determinative factor to decide the seniority or the date of appointment is the decisive factor for the seniority. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment are being quoted as under:

> "25. In the case of State of Uttaranchal and another vs. Dinesh Kumar Sharma reported in (2007) 1 SCC 683, the respondent was claiming seniority from the date anterior to the date, on which he was actually given promotion. The Hon'ble Apex Court found that impermissible, and we may refer to Paragraphs 28, 29 and 34 of the said judgment:
>
> > "28. It is clear from the above that a person appointed on promotion shall not get seniority of any earlier year but shall get the seniority of the year in which his/her appointment is made. Therefore, in the present fact situation the respondent cannot claim promotion from the date of occurrence of the vacancy which is 1995-96 but can only get promotion and seniority from the time he has been substantively appointed i.e. from 1999. Likewise, the seniority also will be counted against the promotion/appointment in the cadre from the date of issuance of order of substantive appointment in the said cadre, i.e. from 19.11.1999.

29. In a recent judgment of this court in Uttaranchal Forest Rangers Association (Direct Recruit) & Ors vs. State of U.P.& Ors 2006(9) Scale 577, (Dr. AR. Lakshmanan and Tarun Chatterjee) this Court was of the view that seniority has to be decided on the basis of Rules in force on the date of appointment, no retrospective promotion or seniority can be granted from a date when an employee has not even been borne in the cadre. Similar view was taken by this Court in the case of K.C.Joshi vs. Union of India 1992 Suppl (1) SCC 272. In State of Bihar & Ors.

34. Another issue that deserves consideration is whether the year in which the vacancy accrues can have any relevance for the purpose of determining the seniority irrespective of the fact when the persons are recruited. Here the respondent's contention is that since the vacancy arose in 1995-96 he should be given promotion and seniority from that year and not from 1999, when his actual appointment letter was issued by the appellant. This cannot be allowed as no retrospective effect can be given to the order of appointment order under the Rules nor is such contention reasonable to normal parlance. This was the view taken by this Court in the case of Jagdish Ch. Patnaik & Ors. vs. State of Orissa & Ors. 1998(4) SCC 456.

36. This observation of the High Court in our view is erroneous. The High Court while observing that, "the appellants rejected the representation of the respondents on the ground that since the appointment letter was issued to the respondent on 19.11.1999, he is entitled to his seniority from that date. The authority has failed to appreciate that if the fact of vacancy being accrued in the recruitment year 1995-96 i.e. on 1st May, 1996 and second vacancy on 1st June 1996 had come to the knowledge of the Commission the Commission could have given the promotion to the petitioner w.e.f. these dates, as the petitioner was entitled for the same and the Commission has found him suitable, which is evident from the promotion order dated 19.11.1999", has committed an error in understanding and appreciating Rule 17 and 21 of the Uttar Pradesh Agriculture Group "B" Service Rules, 1995 and Rule 8 of the U.P. Government Servants Seniority Rules, 1991, which categorically states that the date of 'substantive appointment' will be the date that shall be taken for determining promotion, seniority and other benefits."

27. In the case of Pawan Pratap Singh and others vs. Reevan Singh and others reported in (2011) 3 SCC 267, the question arose with respect to the recruitment to the post of Deputy Jailors. The recruitment was by two sources; direct recruitment and promotions. The actual question, which arose, has been set out in Paragraph 15 of the judgment, which reads as under:

"The contention raised by the writ petitioner (first respondent herein) before the High Court was that in view of the second proviso to rule 5 of 1991 Rules, the Deputy Jailors who were selected in the selection which commenced in 1987 must be treated senior to those selected pursuant to the selection that commenced in 1990. The Division Bench agreed with this contention and held as follows:

> "……In our opinion the correct interpretation of the proviso to Rule 5 of the U.P. Govt. Servant Rules, 1991 is that persons like the petitioner who were selected in the selection process which commenced in 1987 should be treated as senior to there (sic) selected in selection process which commenced in 1990."
>
> 60. We do not think that we should accept this argument as we find that Rule 22(4) is the Rule which will apply in the facts of this case and as we have already noticed and we reiterate that the absence of a single selection may not be fatal to applying Rule 22(4) and we reject the said argument.
>
> 61. It is, no doubt, true that the concept of substantive appointment is not entirely irrelevant as that will have play in its own sphere, but when the matter of inter-se seniority is to be determined between promotees and direct recruits then it must be determined with reference to the mandate of Rule 17 read with Rule 5 and the concept of cyclic order would come in and, therefore, we do not find merit in the said contention."

15. Pursuant to the selection process started in the year 2010-11, the petitioners were appointed through direct recruitment on 01-01-2015 on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police and the private respondents were promoted on the said post on 28-11-2014 meaning thereby that the recruitment on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police was made in one recruitment year that is the period commencing from 01-07-2014 to 30-06-2015. Where the appointments are made from both modes of recruitment, their seniority is to be determined as per Rule 8(3) of the Uttarakhand Government Servant Seniority Rules, 2002. Rule- 22 of the Rules of 2009 provides that in case the recruitment is made from direct recruitment as well as promotion in a year of recruitment in that case combined select list shall be prepared in which the name shall be arranged in accordance with the prescribed percentage of post and the first name shall be of the person who was appointment on the post by way of promotion.

16. For determination of seniority, the provisions of Rule 8(3) of the Uttarakhand Govt. Servants Seniority Rules, 2002 vis-à-vis Rule 22 of the Rules of 2009 would be applicable in the case of the petitioners. The order of substantive appointment of the petitioners is dated 01.01.2015. The petitioners before the Tribunal, are sl. Nos. 110 and 112. The orders of the substantive appointment of the private respondents are 28.11.2014 and the selection years of the private

respondents no. 3 to 5 is 2013-14 and 6 and 7 is 2014-15. Their sl. no in the impugned seniority lists are 99,101,104,105 and 111 respectively. The petitioners and the private respondents have been appointed in the same recruitment year 2014-15. The vacancies irrespective of the selection year should have been filled as per the Rule 23 of Rules of 2009 and the seniority of the appointees of the year 2014-15 should have been determined as per Rule 8 (3) of the Rules of 2002 as per the combined list prepared as per Rule 22 of Rules of 2009. Hence, the impugned seniority list dated 09.06.2022 in respect of the appointees of 2014-15 is liable to be quashed and the seniority decided as per the seniority list dated 10.05.2018 in respect of the appointees of 2014-15 is liable to be restored.

ORDER

The claim petition is hereby allowed. The impugned seniority list in respect of the appointees of the year 2014-15 as per seniority list dated 09.06.2022 is hereby quashed and the seniority in respect of the appointees of 2014-15 decided vide seniority list dated 10.05.2018 is restored. No order as to costs.

(RAJENDRA SINGH)
ACTING CHAIRMAN

(ARUN SINGH RAWAT)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

DATE: OCTOBER 29, 2026.
DEHRADUN
KNP