



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, DHARWAD BENCH

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF AUGUST 2023

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA

WRIT PETITION NO. 104330 OF 2023 (S-RES)



BETWEEN:

SHRI. VENU S. A.
S/O. ANJINAMURTHY,
A/A 34 YEARS, R/A NO.201,
GURUKRUPA RESIDENCY,
2ND FLOOR, 6TH CROSS,
MATHRU LAYOUT,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BENGALURU-560064.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. TARANATH POOJARY, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. MANJUNATH .Y. SHIRUR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE SCIENCES,
R/BY ITS REGISTRAR, KRISHNANGAR,
DHARWAD-580005.
2. VICE-CHANCELLOR /CHAIRMAN OF SELECTION
COMMITTEE, UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE SCIENCES,
DHARWAD-580005.
3. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
R/BY ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560001.
4. DR. D. NAGRAJU M.,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, S/O. MANCHAIHAH,
NEW EXTENSION, CHIKKAMALPURA POST,
HANUR TALUK, CHAMARAJANAGAR-571440.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAMACHANDRA .A. MALI, ADVOCATE FOR R1-R2;





SRI. V.S. KALASURMATH, HCGP FOR R3;
SRI. PRASHANT MATAPATHI, ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, QUASHING THE NOTIFICATION DATED 12.07.2023 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN NO.R/RECTT/ADVT.61/2023, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A, IN SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO APPOINTMENT TO THE CADRE OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF FOOD ENGINEERING AT COLUMN NO.V IN THE NOTIFICATION & ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

The petitioner is before this Court calling in question provisional list of selected candidate to the post of Assistant Professor in Food Engineering in the respondent/University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad ('the University' for short) by Notification dated 12-07-2023.

2. Facts, in brief, adumbrated are as follows:-

The 1st respondent/University issued a notification to fill up backlog posts in the cadres of Professor and Assistant Professor. The petitioner and the private respondent, herein finding themselves eligible, applied pursuant to the said notification. The petitioner and the 4th



respondent were called for document verification by the University along with other applicants. On 27-06-2023, it appears, the 4th respondent was provisionally selected against which the petitioner raised his protest with regard to the Selection Committee deviating from the procedure stipulated and the norms that are necessary to be followed as depicted under the guidelines of the University Grants Commission ('UGC'). On 12.07.2023 a select list is notified to the cadre of Assistant Professor in Food Engineering whereby the 4th respondent emerges as the selected candidate. Immediately thereafter, the petitioner has approached this Court in the subject petition calling in question the said select list. The University undertook before this Court that no further action would be taken upon the select list and, therefore, the appointment order is not issued to the selected candidate - 4th respondent to the post of Assistant Professor, Food Engineering.

3. Heard Sri Tharanath Poojary, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri Ramachandra



A.Mali, learned counsel appearing for respondents 1 and 2, Sri. V.S. Kalasurmath, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.3-State and Sri Prashant Mathapati, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4.

4. The learned senior counsel would contend with vehemence that the select list is prepared purely on the basis of marks obtained in the qualifying examination, contrary to the notification so issued, as the score card method that was necessary to be adopted by the Selection Committee is given a go-bye. This has resulted in the most meritorious candidate – the petitioner losing the post to the 4th respondent who is less meritorious. The learned senior counsel would submit that the University will have to be directed to redo the entire procedure insofar as it concerns the subject post.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the University would submit that the action of the University cannot be found fault with. What is found



in the Notification, is what is found in the Rules. This is a recruitment drive for persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes only, and the Rules would stipulate the method of selection of candidates which the University has strictly complied with. The petitioner in the qualifying examination does not hold more merit than the 4th respondent. It is, therefore, he has called the action in question. He would seek dismissal of the petition.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the 4th respondent would submit that the petitioner has participated in the selection process and having participated he cannot turn around and question the process of selection. The learned counsel would further submit that the 4th respondent is more meritorious as the 4th respondent has secured 89.6% in the qualifying examination while the petitioner is at 85.40% and there is another person in between who scores 87.40% and has been placed in the reserve list. He would, therefore,



submit that the petitioner cannot even thought of getting selected to the said post as he is less meritorious.

7. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner as a rejoinder to the aforesaid submissions would contend that the Notification itself stipulated a particular manner of selection and the post carries UGC pay scales and, therefore, the selection has to be in consonance with what the UGC, through its guidelines, has stipulated from time to time notwithstanding the fact that the recruitment is in terms of the Karnataka State Civil Services (Unfilled vacancies reserved for the persons belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes) (Special Recruitment) Rules, 2001 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Special Rules' for short). It is his case that the petitioner has six years of teaching experience, as Senior Research Associate, which will fetch him six marks, if the score card method is adopted. Further, he has a gold medal for PhD for which he is entitled to 3 marks. Therefore, he would steal a march over the 4th respondent by any means if the



score card method is adopted. He has a right to question the selection of the 4th respondent as merely the selection drive under the Rules cannot mean that there would be violation of norms and guidelines stipulated by the UGC.

8. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective learned counsel and perused the material on record. In furtherance whereof what would fall for consideration is whether the method adopted for selection of candidates is in consonance with law.

9. The notification issued by the University is for recruitment to various posts and the recruitment is under the Special Rules. Rule 6 of the Special Rules is what is germane to be noticed and it reads as follows:-

"6. List of Selected Candidates: (1) The Selecting Authority shall, from among the candidates who have applied in pursuance to the publication inviting applications under rule 5 and who have attained the age of 29 years but not attained the age of 40 years, prepare a list of Candidates for each category of posts in the order



of merit on the basis of percentage of total marks secured in the qualifying examination and taking into consideration the reservation for women, ex-servicemen, physically handicapped and project displaced persons in accordance with the Karnataka Civil Services (General Recruitment) Rules, 1977 and the rural candidates in accordance with the Karnataka Reservation of Appointments or posts (In the Civil Services of the State for Rural Candidates) Act, 2000. If however, sufficient number of candidates, who have attained the age of 29 years but not attained the age of 40 years are not available, the candidates, who have attained the age of 18 years but. not attained the age of 29 years shall also be included in the select list in accordance with the provisions specified above to the extent of such insufficient number.

Provided that if two or more candidates have secured equal percentage of total marks in the qualifying examination, the order of merit in respect of such candidates shall be fixed on the basis of their age, the one older in age being placed higher in the order of merit. The number of candidates to be included in such list of eligible candidates shall be equal to the total number of vacancies notified under these rules.

(2) The list prepared in accordance with sub-rule (1) shall be published in the Official Gazette and shall be valid till all the candidates suitable for appointment notified under these rules are appointed.”



Rule 6 of the Special Rules deals with the manner of preparation of select list. It would mandate that the Selecting Authority, from the list of eligible candidates, shall consider persons who are found eligible and who are aged between 20 and 40 and if no candidate is available to be considered in the said age group, then selection would be of candidates between the age group of 18 to 29. The recruitment is not in dispute, that it is in terms of the Special Rules. The Special Rules would further indicate, apart from the age, the Selecting Authority would prepare a select list in the order of merit on the basis of percentage of total marks secured in the qualifying examination. Therefore, the contention of the University is that it has prepared a select list in the order of merit as obtaining in the qualifying marks. Whether this would suffice, is the question.

10. In terms of the Rules, the University issues a notification, calling for applications from eligible candidates. The Notification is dated 3-03-2023 and the



post of Assistant Professor is one of the cadres that is notified for selection in the discipline of Food Engineering which is the subject matter of the present lis. Apart from the qualifications and other traits of the Notification calling for recruitment, certain instructions are issued in the Notification itself. Two of the instructions which are germane read as follows:

"5. The procedure for selection of candidates for the posts shall be in accordance with the Karnataka Civil Services (Unfilled vacancies reserved for the persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes) (Special Recruitment). Rules, 2001, notified by GOK vide No.DPAR 13 SBC 2001, dated 21.11.2001 and 1.6.2002.

6. The qualifications prescribed for the posts of Teachers are in accordance with the University Notification No.R/Rectt/CAS-2006/B-13/2013 dated 13.3.2013."

The instructions at Clause-5 would depict that it is a recruitment under the Special Rules. This is a factor that is not in dispute. Clause-6 of the instructions is that the qualifications prescribed for the posts of teachers should



be in accordance with the University Notification dated 13-03-2013. What is the University Notification is required to be noticed. The University has issued a notification on 13-03-2013 to implement Regulations governing Recruitment for Promotion of Teachers as stipulated by the UGC/ICAR in the University. The subject of the notification reads as follows:

“Sub:Implementing the Regulations governing Recruitment and Promotion of Teachers as stipulated by the UGC/ ICAR in UAS, Dharwad.”

University adopts the guidelines of the UGC in terms of this Notification. The order insofar as it adopts guidelines reads as follows:

NOTIFICATION

“Sub: Implementing the Regulations governing Recruitment and Promotion of Teachers as stipulated by the UGCAICAR in UAS, Dharwad.

PREAMBLE:

The UGC has notified the Regulations on minimum qualifications for appointment of Teachers and other



Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and measures for the maintenance of standards in Higher Education-2010 vide ref.(1) above. Further, the Dept. of Agricultural Research and Education, Ministry of Agriculture, GOI, New Delhi, vide ref (2) above has endorsed the aforesaid UGC regulations to the State Governments to consider adopting and implementing in respect of State Agricultural Universities. The Government of Karnataka vide its Order cited at ref.(3) above has extended the benefit of 2006 Revised UGC/ICAR pay-scales, among others, to the Teachers, Librarians and equivalent cadres in the University. The aforesaid UGC regulations also provide for the regulations governing Recruitment and Promotion of Teachers. Therefore, the Regulations governing Recruitment and Promotion of Teachers under CAS-2006 along with the Score cards for promotions to various grades, the Template for submission of work-done reports for promotions under CAS-2006 and also the Proforma for Annual Evaluation Report of Teachers have been framed and the same are approved by the competent Authority. Hence the Order.

ORDER:

In pursuance to the aforementioned letters of the UGC/ICAR and the resolution of the Board of Management, the following are adopted in the University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad with effect from the date of publication of this Notification in the Karnataka Gazette.



- 1. Regulations governing Recruitments and Promotions of teachers under CAS- 2006 (Annexure-I);**
- 2. Template for submission of work-done reports for promotions to various grades/cadres/AGP under CAS-2006 (Annexure-II);**
- 3. Score card for promotion of teachers under CAS-2006 (Annexure-III); and**
- 4. Proforma for Annual Evaluation Reports of teachers in the University (Annexure-IV).**

Clause-1 (supra) appends an annexure. The Annexure is Regulations Governing Recruitment and Promotion of Teachers under CAS-2006. Annexure-I directs that the Regulations governing recruitment and promotion of teachers and equivalent cadres would be the one as prescribed by the UGC. The Regulations would apply to all posts of teachers. The UGC in terms of its Notification has depicted implementation of minimum qualification for appointment of teachers in the Universities. It is not in dispute that the University has adopted these guidelines. The coverage in terms of the said notification depicts as follows:



“ 1.0 Coverage

These Regulations are issued for minimum qualifications for appointment and other service conditions of University and College teachers and cadres of Librarians, Directors of Physical Education and Sports for maintenance of standards in higher education and revision of pay-scales.

1.1 For the purposes of direct recruitment to teaching posts in disciplines relating to university and collegiate education, interalia in the fields of health, medicine, special education, agriculture, veterinary and allied fields, technical education, teacher education, norms or standards laid down by authorities established by the relevant Act of Parliament under article 246 of the Constitution for the purpose of co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions, shall prevail

- i. Provided that where no such norms and standards have been laid down by any regulatory authority. UGC Regulations herein shall be applicable till such time as any norms or standards are prescribed by the appropriate regulatory authority.
- ii. Provided further that for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor and equivalent positions pertaining to disciplines in which the National Eligibility Test (NET), conducted by the



University Grants Commission or Council of Scientific and Industrial Research as the case may be, or State level Eligibility Test (SLET) or the State Eligibility Test (SET).conducted by bodies accredited by the UGC for the said purpose, qualifying in NET/SLET/SET shall be an additional requirement.”

“3.12 Qualifications:

No person shall be appointed to the post of University and College teacher, Librarian or Director of Physical Education and Sports, in any university or in any of institutions including constituent or affiliated colleges recognised under clause (f) of Section 2 of the University Grants commission Act, 1956 or in an institution deemed to be a University under Section 3 of the said Act if such person does not fulfil the requirements as to the qualifications for the appropriate post as provided in the Schedule 1 of these Regulations.”

Clause 3.12 thereof depicts that no person shall be appointed to a post in the University unless he is qualified in terms of the guidelines. Therefore, applicability of the UGC guidelines to the University is not in dispute. The qualification stipulated in the Notification is in terms of the Notification supra which is adopting of UGC guidelines. The



issue is whether the score card method is adopted by the University. The answer would be an unequivocal 'Yes' as it is an admitted fact that the University has adopted the score card method for selecting teaching staff, and the Board of Regents have adopted the said method way back on 13-12-2007. Therefore, there is applicability of the score card method; applicability of UGC guidelines cannot be alien to the selection process in the University. It is true that the Notification itself stipulated that qualification will be as prescribed in terms of the Notification dated 13-03-2013. Whether the candidates were aware of the score card method is also discernible from the notification itself. The application for appointment is also appended to the petition. The application at clauses 16 and 19 read as follows:

"16. Particulars of examinations passed and degrees obtained starting from PUC.

Examination or Degree	% age of marks obtained	Subjects	University/ Institution/ Board	Duration From-to	Page No. of documentary evidence attached



17. Details of NET /SET/ SLET clearance:

Particulars	Examination Conducted by	Subject	Year of passing	Page No. of documentary evidence attached

18. Additional Qualifications:

Examination or Degree	% age of marks obtained	Subjects/ Specialization	Institution/ University	Duration From-to	Page No. of documentary evidence attached

19. Medals/Awards/Recognition (during Bachelor's degree and above)

Particulars	Year of award	Awarded for	Awarded by (Name of Univ./Institute)	Page No. of documentary evidence attached

The note appended to the said clauses reads as follows:

*"Note: *In case of securing more than one award for the same degree / achievement, only the highest one will be considered. Relevant entries should be made in the above table.*

*** Awards from Professional Societies / Institutions formed by a group of individuals will not be considered, but National Societies formed by subject specialists within the country and outside will be considered."*



What would unmistakably indicate in the aforesaid clauses which are part of the application itself is that the recruitment will have to be in terms of the Notification. The Notification depicts following of UGC guidelines. The UGC guidelines depict the method of score card to be followed both for recruitment and promotion.

11. The submission of the learned senior counsel for the petitioner would thus stand to reason that the University has itself depicted all these in the application and instructions clearly indicated that the Notification dated 13-03-2013 would be governing the qualification. No doubt the 4th respondent who is now selected in the select list is more meritorious than the petitioner. This is in the qualifying examination. Both them of them have experience in teaching as for the post of Assistant Professor under the guidelines minimum experience is required. The requirement is as depicted under the UGC guidelines and there are several traits in the score card



method which are necessary to be followed to assess merit of a candidate.

12. Stopping at qualifying marks in selecting any candidate would run counter to the spirit of the notification adopting the guidelines of the UGC and would consequently run counter to the UGC guidelines itself. Therefore, the submission of the learned counsel for the 4th respondent that the Rules would only depict that the candidates have to be assessed on the basis of merit in the qualifying examination would tumble down, as the guidelines of the UGC cannot be given a go-bye in the light of the fact that the appointments are being done in the University. If it were to be the appointments in the State Government, it would have been a circumstance altogether different, for non-teaching posts. These are teaching posts and are governed by the guidelines of the UGC. Therefore, there is a fundamental flaw in drawing up of the select list – impugned in the petition.



13. Insofar as the contention of the 4th respondent that the petitioner had participated in the selection process and, therefore, he is estopped from challenging is again a submission that is unacceptable as a candidate by applying to a post accepts the procedure but not the illegality of the Selecting Authority in deviating from the norms. The issue need not detain this Court for long or delve deep in the matter as the Apex Court in the case of **Dr. (MAJOR) MEETA SAHAI v. State of Bihar**¹ considering the entire case law in point has held as follows:

"15. Furthermore, before beginning analysis of the legal issues involved, it is necessary to first address the preliminary issue. The maintainability of the very challenge by the appellant has been questioned on the ground that she having partaken in the selection process cannot later challenge it due to mere failure in selection. The Counsel for the respondents relied upon a catena of decisions of this Court to substantiate his objection.

16. It is well settled that the principle of estoppel prevents a candidate from challenging the selection process after having failed in it as iterated by this Court in a plethora of judgments including Manish Kumar Shahi v. State of Bihar [Manish Kumar Shahi v. State of Bihar, (2010) 12 SCC 576; (2011) 1 SCC (L&S) 256]. observing as follows: (SCC p. 584, para 16)

¹ (2019) 20 SCC 17



"16. We also agree with the High Court [Manish Kumar Shahi v. State of Bihar. 2008 SCC OnLine Pat 321: (2008) 4 PLJR 93] that after having taken part in the process of selection knowing fully well that more than 19% marks have been earmarked for viva voce test, the appellant is not entitled to challenge the criteria or process of selection. Surely, if the appellant's name had appeared in the merit list, he would not have even dreamed of challenging the selection. The [appellant] invoked jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India only after he found that his name does not figure in the merit list prepared by the Commission. This conduct of the appellant clearly disentitles him from questioning the selection and the High Court did not commit any error by refusing to entertain the writ petition." [See also: Madan Lal v. State of J&K, (1995) 3 SCC 486: 1995 SCC (L&S) 712, Marrispati Nagaraja v State of A.P., (2007) 11 SCC 522: (2008) 1 SCC (L&S) 68, Dhananjay Malik v State of Uttaranchal, (2008) 4 SCC 171: (2008) 1 SCC (L&S) 1005 and K.A. Nagamani v. Indian Airlines, (2009) 5 SCC 515 (2009) 2 SCC (L&S) 57)

The underlying objective of this principle is to prevent candidates from trying another shot at consideration, and to avoid an impasse wherein every disgruntled candidate, having failed the selection, challenges it in the hope of getting a second chance.

17. However, we must differentiate from this principle insofar as the candidate by agreeing to participate in the selection process only accepts the prescribed procedure and not the illegality in it. In a situation where a candidate alleges misconstruction of statutory rules and discriminating consequences arising there from, the same cannot be condoned merely because a candidate has partaken in it. The constitutional scheme is sacrosanct and its violation in any manner is impermissible. In fact, a candidate may not have locus to assail the incurable illegality or derogation of the provisions of the Constitution, unless he/she participates in the selection process.



(emphasis supplied)

The said principle is again reiterated by the Apex Court in the case of **NITESH KUMAR PANDEY v. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS**² wherein the Apex Court has held as follows:

*"15. Having taken note of the decisions cited, we have no doubt in our mind that the well-accepted position in law is that the person who has acceded to a position and participated in the process cannot be permitted to approbate and reprobate. It is a norm that if a person/candidate having taken note of a requirement in the notification and even if it is objectionable does not challenge the same but despite having knowledge of the same participates in the said process and takes a chance, on failing in the process such person/candidate cannot turn around and assail the same. **Though that is the position in law, the said position of law will not be applicable to the present case as the facts in the case on hand is not the same. In the cited case of Ashok Kumar, it was a situation where the subsequent notification for written examination was issued after nullifying the result of the earlier written examination. The petitioner therein who had appeared for the examination earlier, having knowingly participated in the process by once again***

² (2020) 4 SCC 70



appearing for the examination which was notified had thereafter challenged, which was a clear case of approbate and reprobate. On the other hand in the instant case, firstly, the revised time schedule issued by the Collector, Rewa cannot be termed as the recruitment notification indicating all the criteria for selection; but can only be termed as a time schedule prescribed pursuant to the recruitment process as provided under the fresh guidelines dated 2-6-2012. Therefore, a candidate already in selection list who has appeared in the computer efficiency test on the date depicted in the revised time schedule cannot be considered to have appeared after having knowledge that the same will also be a part of the assessment for selection and cannot be put on the same pedestal. This is more so in a circumstance wherein the schedule for "18th December" as prescribed reads "...holding of computer efficiency test of selected candidates and those at the top of merit list". A perusal of the same would indicate that the entire selection would be based on the criteria prescribed and the marks as assigned under the fresh guidelines dated 2-6-2012 and appearance for the computer efficiency test would be treated as a requirement which would enable the authorities to assess a person who has otherwise qualified and has been found fit to be in the selected list or is at the top of the merit list."



Therefore, the submission that the petitioner is estopped from challenging the selection process is noted only to be rejected.

14. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent/ University who has vehemently defended the action of the University also contends that judicial review in the process of selection is extremely limited and, therefore, the petition has to be rejected as the selection of a candidate is the prerogative of the University unless it is contrary to law.

15. It is no doubt a settled principle of law that this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution would be loathe to interfere in a selection process. The scrutiny of credentials of candidates, is in the realm of Selection Authority of the University. This Court would not sit in the arm chair of experts and decide who is better – whether the selected candidate or the one who impugned the selection. But, if the selection is contrary to law and is violative of Article 14 of the



Constitution of India, the Court would step in and undo any selection process by a State or any other Authority that would be the State under 12 of the Constitution, to set the wrong right.

16. The case at hand forms a classic illustration of requirement of judicial review by interfering with the selection process as the selection process is contrary to law. Reference being made to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **COMMISSIONER OF POLICE v. RAJ KUMAR**³ wherein it is held as follows:

"31. Public service like any other, presupposes that the State employer has an element of latitude or choice on who should enter its service. Norms. based on principles, govern essential aspects such as qualification, experience, age, number of attempts permitted to a candidate, etc. These, broadly constitute eligibility conditions required of each candidate or applicant aspiring to enter public service. Judicial review, under the Constitution, is permissible to ensure that those norms are fair and reasonable, and applied fairly, in a non- discriminatory manner. However, suitability

³ (2021) 8 SCC 347



is entirely different; the autonomy or choice of the public employer, is greatest, as long as the process of decision- making is neither illegal, unfair, or lacking in bona fides.”

In the light of the judgment of the Apex Court and the facts obtaining noticed hereinabove, the inescapable conclusion would be that the selection of the 4th respondent, is contrary to law. Since no appointment order is issued to the selected candidate i.e., the 4th respondent, the University shall now redo the selection process from the stage at which the illegality is pointed out i.e., in drawing up of the select list by including the score card method, as obtaining under the guidelines of the UGC and adopted by the University for direct recruitment and promotion.

13. For the aforesaid reasons, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) Writ Petition is allowed and the Notification dated 12.07.2023 issued by the 1st respondent



stands quashed insofar as it concerns the 4th respondent.

(ii) A mandamus issues to the 1st respondent/University of Agricultural Sciences to redo the selection process from the stage at which the illegality is pointed out bearing in mind the observations made in the course of the order.

(iii) The University shall undertake such exercise expeditiously and at any rate within eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, regulate its procedure and take the selection to its logical conclusion.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Kmv
ct:bck
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 128