

A EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC.
v.
MAHADEV APPA RAO & ORS.
(Civil Appeal No. 4964 of 2010 etc.)

B JULY 7, 2010

[AFTAB ALAM AND T.S. THAKUR, JJ.]

Administrative Law:

C *Judicial review – Order of administrative authority –*
Canceling typewriting test without assigning reasons – HELD:
An order passed by a public authority must be judged by
reasons stated in the order or the record contemporaneously
maintained – Application of mind by the authority is best
D *disclosed by recording reasons in support of the order –*
Absence of reasons in the order or the contemporaneous
record is suggestive of the order being arbitrary – High Court
rightly set aside the order by which the typewriting test was
cancelled – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and 16
E *– Service Law.*

Service Law:

Appointment – Cancellation of typewriting test –
Challenged by successful candidate – HELD: Although no
F *candidate acquires an indefeasible right to a post merely*
because he has appeared in the examination or even found
a place in the select list, yet State does not enjoy an
unqualified prerogative to refuse an appointment in an
arbitrary fashion or to disregard the merit of the candidates
as reflected in the merit list – The candidates who had
G *appeared in the test and were otherwise eligible for*
appointment were entitled to ensure that selection process was
not allowed to be scuttled for mala fide reasons or in an
arbitrary manner – Validity of such decision is not beyond

judicial review – Judicial review – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and 16 – Locus standi. A

The appellant-organization held a typewriting test on 30.10.2006 for the posts of Chief Typists, and its result was announced on 22.11.2006. On a representation made by some of the unsuccessful candidates, the test was cancelled by order dated 14.12.2006. The said order was challenged before the Central Administrative Tribunal. A fresh typewriting test was held on 16.12.2006. However, result of the second test was not declared. The Tribunal upheld the order dated 14.12.2006. But, the High Court set aside the order of the Tribunal as also the order dated 14.12.2006 and directed the employers to proceed with the selection process as per the first test conducted on 30.10.2006. Aggrieved, the employers as also some of the candidates filed the appeals. B
C
D

Disposing of the appeals, the Court

HELD: 1.1 Article 14 of the Constitution of India strikes at arbitrariness which is an anti thesis of the guarantee contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Whether or not the cancellation of the typing test was arbitrary is a question which the Court shall have to examine once a challenge is mounted to any such action. [para 15] [919-E-G] E
F

1.2 There is no precise statutory or other definition of the term “arbitrary”. Arbitrariness in the making of an order by an authority can manifest itself in different forms. Non-application of mind by the authority making the order is only one of them. Application of mind is best disclosed by recording the reasons that led the authority to pass the order in question. An order passed by a public authority exercising administrative/executive or statutory powers must be judged by the reasons stated in the order or any record or file contemporaneously maintained. The G
H

A infirmity arising out of the absence of reasons cannot be cured by the authority passing the order stating such reasons in an affidavit filed before the court where the validity of any such order is under challenge. Absence of reasons either in the order passed by the authority or in the record contemporaneously maintained is clearly suggestive of the order being arbitrary and, therefore, legally unsustainable. In the instant case, the order passed by the competent authority or the contemporaneous record or file does not state any reasons whatsoever for cancellation of the typing test. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the authority properly applied its mind before passing the order cancelling the test. [para 18, 20 and 21] [920-F-G; 922-C-G]

D *Commissioner of Police, Bombay v. Gordhandas Bhanji* 1952 SCR 135 = AIR 1952 SC 16; *Mohinder Singh Gill and Anr. v. Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi and Ors.* 1978 (2) SCR 272 = (1978) 1 SCC 405; and *R. Vishwanatha Pillai v. State of Kerala & Ors.* 2004 (1) SCR 360 = (2004) 2 SCC 105; and *Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd. v. Darius Shapur Chenai & Ors.* 2005 Suppl. (3) SCR 388 = (2005) 7 SCC 627 - relied on.

F *Kumari Shrilekha Vidyarthi and Ors. v. State of U.P. and Ors.* 1990 Suppl. (1) SCR 625 = AIR 1991 SC 537 – referred to.

G Black's Law Dictionary; *Corpus Juris Secundum*; and "Judicial Review of Administrative Action" by Prof. De Smith, Woolf & Jowell – referred to.

H 1.3 Although no candidate acquires an indefeasible right to a post merely because he has appeared in the examination or even found a place in the select list, yet the State does not enjoy an unqualified prerogative to refuse an appointment in an arbitrary fashion or to

disregard the merit of the candidates as reflected by the merit list prepared at the end of the selection process. The validity of the State's decision not to make an appointment is thus a matter which is not beyond judicial review before a competent writ court. If any such decision is found to be arbitrary, appropriate directions can be issued in the matter. In the instant case, the least which the candidates who were otherwise eligible for appointment and who had appeared in the examination that constituted a step in aid of a possible appointment in their favour, were entitled to is to ensure that the selection process was not allowed to be scuttled for malafide reasons or in an arbitrary manner. [para 13 and 15] [918-D-G; 919-D-F]

Shankarsan Dash v. Union of India 1991 (2) SCR 567 = (1991) 3 SCC 47; and *Union Territory of Chandigarh v. Dilbagh Singh and Ors.* 1992 Suppl. (2) SCR 311 = (1993) 1 SCC 154 – relied on.

Union of India and Ors. v. Tarun K. Singh and Ors. (2003) 11 SCC 768 – referred to.

2.1 The fact that some representations were received against the test or the procedure followed for the same, could not by itself justify cancellation of the test unless the authority concerned applied its mind to the allegations levelled by the persons making the representation, came to the conclusion that the grievance made in the complaint was not without merit and recorded reasons as to why in its opinion it was necessary to cancel the test. In the instant case, the order of cancellation passed by the competent authority was not preceded even by a prima facie satisfaction about the correctness of the allegations made by the unsuccessful candidates leave alone an inquiry into the same. The order of cancellation passed by the competent authority falls short of the legal requirements and was rightly quashed by the High Court. [para 22-23] [923-A-B; F-G; 924-C]

A 2.2 While application of mind to the material available
to the competent authority is an essential pre-requisite
for the making of a valid order, that requirement should
not be confused with the sufficiency of such material to
support any such order. Sufficiency or otherwise of the
B material and so also its admissibility to support a decision
the validity whereof is being judicially reviewed may even
otherwise depend upon the facts and circumstances of
each case. No hard and fast rule can be formulated in that
regard. So also whether the competent authority ought
C to have conducted an enquiry into or verification of the
allegations before passing an order of cancellation is a
matter that would depend upon the facts and
circumstances of each case. But what is absolutely
essential is that the authority making the order is alive to
D the material on the basis of which it purports to take a
decision. [para 24] [924-D-H; 925-A-B]

3. The competent authority would re-examine the
matter in the context of the representation received by it,
and if upon due and proper consideration thereof, it
E comes to the conclusion that the test earlier held suffered
from any infirmity or did not give a fair opportunity to all
the candidates, it shall be free to pass a fresh order
cancelling the said examination after recording such a
finding in which event the second test conducted under
F the directions of the Tribunal would become the basis for
the selection process to be finalized in accordance with
law. In case, however, the authority comes to the
conclusion that the earlier test suffered from no
procedural or other infirmity or did not cause any
G prejudice to any candidate, the second test/examination
shall stand cancelled and the process of appointment
shall be finalized on the basis of the test held earlier. The
order passed by the High Court is to that extent modified.
[para 25] [925-D-G; 926-A-B]

H

EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC. v. MAHADEV 913
APPA RAO & ORS.

Case Law Reference:

A

1952 SCR 135	relied on	para 8
1978 (2) SCR 272	relied on	para 9
2004 (1) SCR 360	relied on	para 10
2005 Suppl. (3) SCR 388	relied on	para 10
2003) 11 SCC 768	referred to	para 11
1991 (2) SCR 567	relied on	para 12
1992 Suppl. (2) SCR 311	relied on	para 14
1990 Suppl. (1) SCR 625	referred to	para 18

B

C

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 4964 of 2010.

D

From the Judgment & Order dated 05.11.2007 of the High Court of Judicature Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad in W.P. No. 15196 of 2007.

WITH

E

C.A. Nos. 4965-4966 of 2010.

P.P. Malhotra, ASG, Satya Siddiqui, S.K. Mishra , V.B. Gugnani, Anil Katiyar, Y. Raja Gopala Rao, Ramesh, Y. Vismai for the Appellants.

F

Gireesh Kumar, Vijay Kumar for the Respondents.

The following Judgment of the Court was delivered

1. Leave granted.

G

2. These appeals arise out of an order passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad whereby Writ Petition No.15196 of 2007 has been allowed and the order passed by

H

A the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench in OA No.748 of 2006 set aside.

3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, East Coast Railway, Visakhapatnam, issued a notification proposing to conduct a written/practical typewriting test for filling up the vacant posts of Chief Typists in the pay-scale of Rs.5500-9000. In response as many as 12 candidates appeared in the test held on 30th October, 2006 the result whereof was announced on 22nd November, 2006. Some of the candidates who failed to qualify made a representation complaining about the manner in which the test was conducted alleging that defective typewriting machines provided to them placed them at a disadvantage vis-a-vis candidates declared successful. The successful candidates also appear to have made a representation impressing upon the authorities to go ahead with the interviews and to complete the selection process expeditiously. Since that did not happen, OA No.748 of 2006 was filed before the CAT by one of the successful candidates for a direction to respondent to proceed with the selection. In the meantime the Divisional Manager of the appellant-Railways issued an order on 14th of December, 2006 cancelling the typewriting test conducted on 30th October, 2006. By another notification of even date a fresh typewriting test was notified to be held on 16th December, 2006 for all the 12 in-service candidates who had appeared in the earlier test. By an interim order passed by the Tribunal the railway authorities were allowed to conduct the proposed second test in which the applicant before the Tribunal could also appear. The applicant was at the same time permitted to amend the prayer in the OA to assail the order passed by the Divisional Manager of the Railways cancelling the earlier test.

4. It is not in dispute that pursuant to the said notification and the order passed by the Tribunal a fresh test was indeed conducted in which all the eligible in-service candidates appeared although the result of the said test has not been

EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC. v. MAHADEV 915
APPA RAO & ORS.

announced so far. The Tribunal eventually dismissed OA A
No.748 of 2006 holding that the test earlier conducted was
rightly cancelled inasmuch as the candidates were made to
take the test in batches and no option was given to them to bring
their own typewriters. The Tribunal further held that although
some of the candidates had made representation as early as B
on 23rd October, 2006 seeking permission to use computers
their request was not considered. All this according to the
Tribunal justified the cancellation of the typewriting test held on
30th October and the issue of a notification for a fresh test.

5. Aggrieved by the order passed by the Tribunal Shri C
Mahadev Appa Rao declared successful in the first test filed
Writ Petition No.15196/2007 before the High Court of Andhra
Pradesh which has by the order impugned in the present
appeal allowed the same and set aside the order passed by D
the Tribunal as also the order by which the earlier test was
cancelled. The High Court further directed the respondent to
proceed with the selection process pursuant to notification
dated 18th October, 2006 and the practical test conducted on
30th October, 2006 in terms thereof. The present appeals, as
noted above, assail the correctness of the said order. E

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties at some
length and perused the record. The High Court has found fault
with the order cancelling the earlier test primarily because the
same was unsupported by any reasons whatsoever. The said F
order is in the following words:

"The practical test conducted to Hd. Typists in scale
Rs.5000-8000 (RSRP) on 30.10.2006 in connection with
the selection of Chief Typist in scale Rs.5500-9000
(RSRP) to form a panel of 4 UR + 1 SC and the results G
published vide O.A. No. Estt/Pers/52/2006, Dt. 22.12.2006
are hereby cancelled."

7. The High Court was also of the view that no reasons
for cancellation of the test having been recorded even on the H

A file contemporaneously maintained for that purpose, the same could not be supplied in the affidavit filed in reply to the Writ Petition challenging the said order, especially when the cancellation of the test was not according to the High Court necessitated by any irregularity in the conduct of the test or any mala fides vitiating the same. In the absence of any such infirmity the cancellation of the examination was arbitrary and unsustainable, declared the High Court.

8. There is no quarrel with the well-settled proposition of law that an order passed by a public authority exercising administrative/executive or statutory powers must be judged by the reasons stated in the order or any record or file contemporaneously maintained. It follows that the infirmity arising out of the absence of reasons cannot be cured by the authority passing the order stating such reasons in an affidavit filed before the Court where the validity of any such order is under challenge. The legal position in this regard is settled by the decisions of this Court in *Commissioner of Police, Bombay v. Gordhandas Bhanji* (AIR 1952 SC 16) wherein this Court observed :

“Public orders, publicly made, in exercise of a statutory authority cannot be construed in the light of explanations subsequently given by the officer making the order of what he meant, or of what was in his mind, or what he intended to do. Public orders made by public authorities are meant to have public effect and are intended to affect the actings and conduct of those to whom they are addressed and must be construed objectively with reference to the language used in the order itself. ”

9. Reference may also be made to the decision of this Court in *Mohinder Singh Gill and Anr. v. Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi and Ors.* (1978) 1 SCC 405 where this Court reiterated the above principle in the following words:

“8. The second equally relevant matter is that when a

statutory functionary makes an order based on certain grounds, its validity must be judged by the reasons so mentioned and cannot be supplemented by fresh reasons in the shape of affidavit or otherwise. Otherwise, an order bad in the beginning may, by the time it comes to court on account of a challenge, get validated by additional grounds later brought out.”

10. Later decisions of this Court in *R. Vishwanatha Pillai v. State of Kerala & Ors.* (2004) 2 SCC 105 and *Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd. v. Darius Shapur Chenai & Ors.* (2005) 7 SCC 627 have re-stated the legal position settled by the earlier two decisions noticed above.

11. Relying upon the decision of this Court in *Union of India and Ors. v. Tarun K. Singh and Ors.* (2003) 11 SCC 768, Mr. Malhotra all the same argued that the challenge to the order cancelling the test was legally untenable as no candidate had any legally enforceable right to any post until he was selected and an order of appointment issued in his favour. Cancellation of the selection process on the ground of malpractices could not, therefore, be subjected to judicial scrutiny before a Writ Court, at the instance of a candidate who had not even found a place in the select list.

12. A Constitution Bench of this Court in *Shankarsan Dash v. Union of India* (1991) 3 SCC 47 had an occasion to examine whether a candidate seeking appointment to a civil post can be regarded to have acquired an indefeasible right to appointment again such post merely because his name appeared in the merit list of candidates for such post. Answering the question in the negative this Court observed:

“It is not correct to say that if a number of vacancies are notified for appointment and adequate number of candidates are found fit, the successful candidates acquire an indefeasible right to be appointed which cannot be

A legitimately denied. Ordinarily the notification merely amounts to an invitation to qualified candidates to apply for recruitment and on their selection they do not acquire any right to the post. Unless the relevant recruitment rules so indicate, the State is under no legal duty to fill up all or

B any of the vacancies. However, it does not mean that the State has the licence of acting in an arbitrary manner. The decision not to fill up the vacancies has to be taken bona fide for appropriate reasons. And if the vacancies or any of them are filled up, the State is bound to respect the

C comparative merit of the candidates, as reflected at the recruitment test, and no discrimination can be permitted. This correct position has been consistently followed by this Court, and we do not find any discordant note in the decisions in the *State of Haryana v. Subhash Chander Marwaha* 1974 (3) SCC 220; *Neelima Shangla (Miss) v. State of Haryana* 1986(4) SCC 268 or *Jitender Kumar v. State of Punjab* 1985 (1) SCC 122."

D

13. It is evident from the above that while no candidate acquires an indefeasible right to a post merely because he has

E appeared in the examination or even found a place in the select list, yet the State does not enjoy an unqualified prerogative to refuse an appointment in an arbitrary fashion or to disregard the merit of the candidates as reflected by the merit list prepared at the end of the selection process. The validity of the

F State's decision not to make an appointment is thus a matter which is not beyond judicial review before a competent Writ court. If any such decision is indeed found to be arbitrary, appropriate directions can be issued in the matter.

G 14. To the same effect is the decision of this Court in *Union Territory of Chandigarh v. Dilbagh Singh and Ors.* (1993) 1 SCC 154, where again this Court reiterated that while a candidate who finds a place in the select list may have no vested right to be appointed to any post, in the absence of any specific rules entitling him to the same, he may still be aggrieved

H

EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC. v. MAHADEV 919
APPA RAO & ORS.

of his non-appointment if the authority concerned acts arbitrarily or in a malafide manner. That was also a case where selection process had been cancelled by the Chandigarh Administration upon receipt of complaints about the unfair and injudicious manner in which the select list of candidates for appointment as conductors in CTU was prepared by the Selection Board. An inquiry got conducted into the said complaint proved the allegations made in the complaint to be true. It was in that backdrop that action taken by the Chandigarh Administration was held to be neither discriminatory nor unjustified as the same was duly supported by valid reasons for cancelling what was described by this Court to be as a "dubious selection".

15. Applying these principles to the case at hand there is no gainsaying that while the candidates who appeared in the typewriting test had no indefeasible or absolute right to seek an appointment, yet the same did not give a licence to the competent authority to cancel the examination and the result thereof in an arbitrary manner. The least which the candidates who were otherwise eligible for appointment and who had appeared in the examination that constituted a step in aid of a possible appointment in their favour, were entitled to is to ensure that the selection process was not allowed to be scuttled for malafide reasons or in an arbitrary manner. It is trite that Article 14 of the Constitution strikes at arbitrariness which is an anti thesis of the guarantee contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Whether or not the cancellation of the typing test was arbitrary is a question which the Court shall have to examine once a challenge is mounted to any such action, no matter the candidates do not have an indefeasible right to claim an appointment against the advertised posts.

16. What then is meant for arbitrary/arbitrariness and how far can the decision of the competent authority in the present case be described as arbitrary? Black's Law Dictionary describes the term "arbitrary" in the following words:

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A "1. Depending on individual discretion; specif., determined by a judge rather than by fixed rules, procedures, or law. 2. (Of a judicial decision) founded on prejudice or preference rather than on reason or fact. This type of decision is often termed arbitrary and capricious."

B 17. To the same effect is the meaning given to the expression "arbitrary" by *Corpus Juris Secundum* which explains the term in the following words:

C "ARBITRARY – Based alone upon one's will, and not upon any course of reasoning and exercise of judgment; bound by no law; capricious; exercised according to one's own will or caprice and therefore conveying a notion of a tendency to abuse possession of power; fixed or done capriciously or at pleasure, without adequate determining principle, nonrational, or not done or acting according to reason or judgment; not based upon actuality but beyond a reasonable extent; not founded in the nature of things; not governed by any fixed rules or standard; also, in a somewhat different sense, absolute in power, despotic, or tyrannical; harsh and unforbearing. When applied to acts, "arbitrary" has been held to connote a disregard of evidence or of the proper weight thereof; to express an idea opposed to administrative, executive, judicial, or legislative discretion; and to imply at least an element of bad faith, and has been compared with "willful".

D

E

F

G 18. There is no precise statutory or other definition of the term "arbitrary". In *Kumari Shrilekha Vidyarthi and Ors. v. State of U.P. and Ors.* (AIR 1991 SC 537), this Court explained that the true import of the expression "arbitrariness" is more easily visualized than precisely stated or defined and that whether or not an act is arbitrary would be determined on the facts and circumstances of a given case. This Court observed:

H "The meaning and true import of arbitrariness is more easily visualized than precisely stated or defined. The

question, whether an impugned act is arbitrary or not, is ultimately to be answered on the facts and in the circumstances of a given case. An obvious test to apply is to see whether there is any discernible principle emerging from the impugned act and if so, does it satisfy the test of reasonableness. Where a mode is prescribed for doing an act and there is no impediment in following that procedure, performance of the act otherwise and in a manner which does not disclose any discernible principle which is reasonable, may itself attract the vice of arbitrariness. Every State action must be informed by reason and it follows that an act uninformed by reason, is arbitrary. Rule of law contemplates governance by laws and not by humour, whims or caprices of the men to whom the governance is entrusted for the time being. It is trite that 'be you ever so high, the laws are above you'. This is what men in power must remember, always." A
B
C
D

19. Dealing with the principle governing exercise of official power *Prof. De Smith, Woolf & Jowell* in their celebrated book on "*Judicial Review of Administrative Action*" emphasized how the decision-maker invested with the wide discretion is expected to exercise that discretion in accordance with the general principles governing exercise of power in a constitutional democracy unless of course the statute under which such power is exercisable indicates otherwise. One of the most fundamental principles of rule of law recognized in all democratic systems is that the power vested in any competent authority shall not be exercised arbitrarily and that the power is exercised that it does not lead to any unfair discrimination. The following passage from the above is in this regard apposite: E
F
G

"We have seen in a number of situations how the scope of an official power cannot be interpreted in isolation from general principles governing the exercise of power in a constitutional democracy. The courts presume that these H

A principles apply to the exercise of all powers and that even
 where the decision-maker is invested with wide discretion,
 that discretion is to be exercised in accordance with those
 principles unless Parliament clearly indicates otherwise.
 B One such principle, the rule of law, contains within it a
 number of requirements such as the right of the individual
 to access to the law and that power should not be
 arbitrarily exercised. The rule of law above all rests upon
 the principle of legal certainty, which will be considered
 here, along with a principle which is partly but not wholly
 C contained within the rule of law, namely, the principle of
 equality, or equal treatment without unfair discrimination."

20. Arbitrariness in the making of an order by an authority
 can manifest itself in different forms. Non-application of mind
 by the authority making the order is only one of them. Every
 D order passed by a public authority must disclose due and
 proper application of mind by the person making the order. This
 may be evident from the order itself or the record
 contemporaneously maintained. Application of mind is best
 demonstrated by disclosure of mind by the authority making the
 E order. And disclosure is best done by recording the reasons
 that led the authority to pass the order in question. Absence of
 reasons either in the order passed by the authority or in the
 record contemporaneously maintained is clearly suggestive of
 the order being arbitrary hence legally unsustainable.

F 21. In the instant case the order passed by the competent
 authority does not state any reasons whatsoever for the
 cancellation of the typing test. It is nobody's case that any such
 reasons were set out even in any contemporaneous record or
 G file. In the absence of reasons in support of the order it is difficult
 to assume that the authority had properly applied its mind before
 passing the order cancelling the test.

H 22. Mr. Malhotra's contention that the order was passed
 entirely on the basis of the complaint received from the

EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC. v. MAHADEV 923
APPA RAO & ORS.

unsuccessful candidates is also of no assistance. The fact that some representations were received against the test or the procedure followed for the same could not by itself justify cancellation of the test unless the authority concerned applied its mind to the allegations levelled by the persons making the representation and came to the conclusion that the grievance made in the complaint was not without merit. If a test is cancelled just because some complaints against the same have been made howsoever frivolous, it may lead to a situation where no selection process can be finalized as those who fail to qualify can always make a grievance against the test or its fairness. What is important is that once a complaint or representation is received the competent authority applies its mind to the same and records reasons why in its opinion it is necessary to cancel the examination in the interest of purity of the selection process or with a view to preventing injustice or prejudice to those who have appeared in the same. That is precisely what had happened in *Dilbagh Singh's* case (supra). The examination was cancelled upon an inquiry into the allegations of unjust, arbitrary and dubious selection list prepared by the Selection Board in which the allegations were found to be correct. Even in *Tarun K. Singh's* case (supra) relied upon by *Mr. Malhotra* an inquiry into the complaints received against the selection process was conducted no matter after the cancellation of the examination. This Court in that view held that since the selection process was vitiated by procedural and other infirmities cancellation thereof was perfectly justified.

23. That is not, however, the position in the instant case. The order of cancellation passed by the competent authority was not preceded even by a prima facie satisfaction about the correctness of the allegations made by the unsuccessful candidates leave alone an inquiry into the same. The minimum that was expected of the authority was a due and proper application of mind to the allegations made before it and formulation and recording of reasons in support of the view that the competent authority was taking. There may be cases where

A an enquiry may be called for into the allegations, but there may also be cases, where even on admitted facts or facts verified from record or an enquiry howsoever summary the same maybe, it is possible for the competent authority to take a decision, that there are good reasons for making the order
 B which the authority eventually makes. But we find it difficult to sustain an order that is neither based on an enquiry nor even a prima facie view taken upon a due and proper application of mind to the relevant facts. Judged by that standard the order of cancellation passed by the competent authority falls short of
 C the legal requirements and was rightly quashed by the High Court.

24. We may hasten to add that while application of mind to the material available to the competent authority is an essential pre-requisite for the making of a valid order, that
 D requirement should not be confused with the sufficiency of such material to support any such order. Whether or not the material placed before the competent authority was in the instant case sufficient to justify the decision taken by it, is not in issue before us. That aspect may have assumed importance only if the
 E competent authority was shown to have applied its mind to whatever material was available to it before cancelling the examination. Since application of mind as a thresh-hold requirement for a valid order is conspicuous by its absence the question whether the decision was reasonable having regard
 F to the material before the authority is rendered academic. Sufficiency or otherwise of the material and so also its admissibility to support a decision the validity whereof is being judicially reviewed may even otherwise depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast rule can be
 G formulated in that regard nor do we propose to do so in this case. So also whether the competent authority ought to have conducted an enquiry into or verification of the allegations before passing an order of cancellation is a matter that would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. It may

H

EAST COAST RAILWAY & ANR. ETC. v. MAHADEV 925
APPA RAO & ORS.

often depend upon the nature, source and credibility of the material placed before the authority. It may also depend upon whether any such exercise is feasible having regard to the nature of the controversy, the constraints of time, effort and expense. But what is absolutely essential is that the authority making the order is alive to the material on the basis of which it purports to take a decision. It cannot act mechanically or under an impulse, for a writ court judicially reviewing any such order cannot countenance the exercise of power vested in a public authority except after due and proper application of mind. Any other view would amount to condoning a fraud upon such power which the authority exercising the same holds in trust only to be exercised for a legitimate purpose and along settled principles of administrative law.

25. The next question then is whether the selection should be finalized on the basis of the test held earlier or the matter allowed to be re-examined by the authority in the context of the representation received by it. In our opinion the latter course would be more in tune with the demands of justice and fairness especially when a second test has been conducted in which all the in service candidates have appeared. The result of this examination/test has not, however, been declared so far apparently because of the pendency of these proceedings. If upon due and proper consideration of the representation received from the candidates who were unsuccessful in the first examination, the competent authority comes to the conclusion that the test earlier held suffered from any infirmity or did not give a fair opportunity to all the candidates, it shall be free to pass a fresh order cancelling the said examination after recording such a finding in which event the second test conducted under the directions of the Tribunal would become the basis for the selection process to be finalized in accordance with law. In case, however, the authority comes to the conclusion that the earlier test suffered from no procedural or other infirmity or did not cause any prejudice to any candidate.

- A the second test/examination shall stand cancelled and the process of selection finalized on the basis of the test held earlier. The order passed by the High Court is to that extent modified and the present appeals disposed of leaving the parties to bear their own costs. In order to avoid any delay in
- B the finalization of the process of appointments which have already been delayed, we direct that the competent authority shall pass an appropriate order on the subject expeditiously but not later than two months from today.

R.P.

Appeals disposed of.