

Copy of letter No. 8401-4GS-61/33117, dated Chandigarh, the 8th/11th September, from the Chief Secretary to Government, Punjab to all Heads of Departments, etc. etc.

Subject :—Procedure to be followed in selection of officers/officials for promotion to higher posts—Greater emphasis on merit than on seniority.

I am directed to invite a reference to Punjab Government letter No. 9129-G-56/3964, dated the 17th September, 1956, and No. 4044-5GS-61/23179, dated the 28th June, 1961, on this subject, and to clarify the following points about which doubts have been expressed :—

Point I.—Officials A, B, C and D are eligible for promotion. B, C and D are suitable; but A is not quite suitable. Can A be provisionally promoted subject to a subsequent special report on his performance on the higher post ?

Clarification.—It would be wrong to provisionally promote an official about whose suitability doubt is entertained by the appointing authority. Only those officials are required to be considered for promotion who are suitable at the time of selection. There is, therefore, no justification to promote 'A' with the stipulation indicated.

Point II.—Officials A, B, C, D, E, F and G are eligible for promotion. A is unsuitable and only B, C, D, and E are approved for promotion. B, C and D are promoted but before E can be promoted a satisfactory report is received about the work of A.

(i) Will the next vacancy go to E or will he be considered afresh along with A and F for it ?

(ii) How many annual good reports should A earn before he can be considered suitable for promotion ?

Clarification.—(i) As E established his suitability earlier, the next vacancy should go to him, unless a fairly long period (say two years or more) has passed since the original list was made in which case the matter should be considered on over all merits as to whether A has established his competence so clearly as to take precedence over E.

(ii) The number of annual reports cannot be fixed for universal application but in any case normally at least one fresh annual report should come in before the question of an ignored official's suitability is reopened.

Point III.—Official A is considered unsuitable and official B is suitable for promotion. B is promoted but later on, has to revert for want of a vacancy. By the time a vacancy arises again, A too has become suitable. Will this vacancy go to B ?

Clarification.—As the claim of B for the vacancy has been established earlier and he has also officiated in the higher post for some time, B should normally get the vacancy in preference to A.

Point IV.—Official A is promoted from a lower to a higher post. His performance on the higher post is adjudged unsatisfactory and he is reverted to the lower post.

(i) For how long should A put in satisfactory work in the lower post before he can be considered suitable for promotion ?

(ii) By the time A is considered suitable for promotion, B and C have been promoted. Will A on promotion rank senior or junior to B and C in the higher post ?

Clarification.—(i) All though no hard and fast policy as to the period for which official A should wait for being considered for promotion to a higher post again, can be laid down it is necessary to exercise caution on each occasion. It will be necessary to first of all decide whether he is at the particular time fit for promotion or not. If he is considered fit by the competent authority, his name should be considered in a panel of three for one post.

(ii) It would be manifestly wrong to reassign A his old seniority in the higher post. The fact of his reversion on account of unsatisfactory work will decidedly go against him. A should, therefore, rank junior to B and C in the higher post on his re-appointment, unless there are specific rules to the contrary for the particular service.

2. I am to request that these clarifications may please be brought to the notice of all concerned