



INCOME TAX GAZETTED OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

WB UNIT

Aayakar Bhavan, 6th Floor, Room No. 28, P - 7, Chowringhee Square, Kolkata - 700 069

President : Mrinal Kanti Chanda
Bhattacharya

General Secretary : Bhaskar

9477331010

8902198888

Date: 03-01-2014

To
The Secretary General
ITGOA,
New Delhi.

Dear Comrade,

At the outset we extend our greetings for the New Year 2014. We are glad to see a communiqué from the CHQ at long last, and sincerely hope that pall of gloom that have descended on us would soon give way and the new year will witness a new dawn.

We were given to understand that both the ITGOA and the Sub-committee no.1 decided that the Committee would work upon recommending the Region-wise allocation of the additional posts/officers/officials available in CRC. But as per the draft report of the Sub-committee no.1, the WB region is likely to suffer a decrease of almost 500 posts from the existing sanctioned strength in different cadres. The JCA, WB immediately pointed this out to the Conveners, JCA but received no reply. The JCA, WB then decided to launch agitational programme before the local CCIT(CCA) to compel him to impress upon the Board that existing sanctioned strength cannot be decreased as a result of CRC and this charge may be allowed to retain at least the existing strength. Our memorandum in the issue along with programme of action was forwarded immediately to the Conveners, JCA and Com. Secretary General, ITGOA appreciated our move over telephone.(!)

Your letter dated 30-12-2013 puts the entire matter in a different flavor. **Instead of putting your weight behind the state unit in favour of their just demand against decrease of existing sanctioned strength, you chose to play the role of the defender of the Board's committee, confusing other state units with the circulation of wrong statistics analyzed with ulterior motive.** We know that the All India BGM – and so, a possible election - is round the corner, but do you really realise what you are doing? You may not acknowledge it, but can you fail to understand that the agitation launched by JCA, WB, is only to protest

the **decrease** of **existing manpower** in WB charge and NOT against the increase of sanctioned strength in any other charge? **Can the shortfall in West Bengal not be met from the central pool/directorates? Would that harm any other charge's interest?** Do you realise that your effort to pin down the agitation launched by JCA, WB, and your effort to campaign against WB through your well-circulated letter only **weakens** the Association and emboldens the sectarian views of our IRS brethren who would be only too happy to see the ITGOA, CHQ spoil an organizational issue for somebody's personal interest? Do you realise that you are actively breaking down the unity of ITGOA unilaterally?

It seems the CHQ, which gave in on every occasion before the CBDT during last so many years, has suddenly become invigorated in the 'slog over' of their tenure. So much so it is about to set everything right, even so called injustice done to 1988 batch ITIs of Bihar. So how far backwards should we go? Should we review the creation of SSC in early seventies for region based allocation of posts? Should we review *Freight Rationalization Principle* of sixties which stripped off the fortune of eastern states (including mineral rich Bihar & Jharkhand)? Should we review the British Rule which introduced Civil Service with inherent disparity? So our prudent leadership has thought it appropriate to walk down the memory lane when the career prospect of most of our members (ITOs) has been placed under guillotine. **Moreover only the mention of states in stagnation list i.e. Mumbai, Bihar, NWR, Kerala etc. is not a mere coincidence, because stagnation in other units like UP(E), UP(W), Karnataka, Gujarat etc. were overlooked, due to reasons best known to the CHQ.**

The CHQ failed to persuade ITEF in last seven months to come forward in favour of the demand of 'promotion from ITO to ACIT in one go' but now you prefer to write a six page letter on stagnation in the cadre of ITI. Perusal of the opening sentences of your communiqué gives an impression that four years after the CRC exercise was conceived, seven months after cabinet nod was given and thirty days after submission of the report of Mirani Committee (ITGOA representative received the report through mail on 30.11.13. itself), the CHQ has suddenly discovered that there is a disparity in waiting period for promotion to the post of ITO from ITI among different CCA regions. **But it is a matter of fact that the CHQ of ITGOA had never bothered to consider stagnation as one of the criterion for allocation of posts before writing this letter, or for that matter, they never bothered to formulate any parameter to be applied for post-distribution.** So, is not this something only to create division among different units of ITGOA?

As for the stagnation in WB region in the cadre of ITI, it is true that a few inspectors have sporadically been promoted within 3-4 years. **But these were all temporary and anomalous phases**, brought on by two local factors: (i) **large-scale retirements** causing a sudden increase in vacancies (ii) the **lack of adequate number of qualified candidates** (due to reluctance of inspectors to appear for ITO-ship examination, as promotion prospects are very bleak ordinarily). BUT, this is **not unique to WB charge**. For example, in the Bihar charge, some Inspectors of 1988 batch from Bihar were getting promotion to the rank of ACIT in 2001, JCIT in 2011 and enjoy the projections of longest tenure as a CIT from the cadre of Inspector. Similar instances are there in other charges too. **In WB charge, the average waiting period has subsequently shot up to 7-9 years** (as evident from the table given below). **To state that the**

stagnation in WB charge is less than national average is not only false but lacks any empirical data, as becomes clear from the data below:

Comparative charts for promotion from ITI to ITO

<u>Year of promotion</u>	<u>Year of exam.</u>	<u>Year of Joining</u>	<u>Time taken in years from Year of Exam.</u>	<u>Time taken in years from Date of Joining</u>	<u>Total promotions effected</u>
2001	1990 1991 1992 1993	1992 1993 1994 1995	11 10 9 8	9 8 7 6	200 (153 for 2000-01 + 47 for 2001-02)
2002	1993 1994	1995 1996	9 8	7 6	62
2003	1994 1995	1996 1997	9 8	7 6	55
2004	1996	20 (All promotee or inspectors of earlier batch) No direct intake
2005	40 (All promotee or inspectors of earlier batch)No direct intake
2006	19 (All promotee or inspectors of earlier batch) No direct intake
2007	1996/1999	2003	11/8	4/4	28 (Only 4 persons got promoted out of direct recruit)
2008	1996/1999	2003	12/9	5/5	22 (only 08 persons belonged to direct quota)
2009	1996/1999	2003	13/10	6/6	79 (only 02 persons belonged to direct quota)

Present-day Stagnation for direct-recruit Inspectors

Year of examination	Year of Joining	No. of Direct Recruit inspectors waiting for promotion	Remarks
2005	2008	43	4

			promoted in 2012
2006	2009	29	
2008	2010	8	
2010	2011	125	
2011	2012	55	

Total direct recruit Inspectors: 2008 to 2012: 260

Total promotee inspector : 520 (approx.)

TOTAL 780

No. of qualified inspectors as on 01/01/2013: 200 (approx.)

No. of available vacancy : 22 (Approx.) for R.Yr. 2013-2014

Another addition vide 2013 Departmental examination : 83 (Approx.)

Likely Vacancy arising due to superannuation of ITOs in different Recruitment Years in W.B Region:

Recruitment Year	Number
14-15	11
15-16	06
16-17	09
17-18	16
18-19	22

Please, Comrade; read and desist. Cease the intentional falsification of facts regarding post distributions.

The role of the CHQ, since the very first day this CRC was conceptualized, was with much reluctance. The matter was first placed at Hyderabad BGM in 2010 and never discussed subsequently. Everything was done in a surreptitious manner without eliciting any suggestion from the general members of various state units. Finally when the entire matter was placed before the house in Mumbai BGM, 2012, tall claims were made in a well decorated booklet.

Equally bombastic assurances about creation of record number of posts in level of ACIT and filling up all new and consequent posts by promotion at one go were made. On 22.07.2011 while addressing the general members of ITGOA, WB unit, at Kolkata the Secretary General had reiterated above claims and even boasted that this cadre restructuring would be better than the CRC- 2001 in all respect. But the result is for all to see:

- while ITEF and IRS Association bagged the bulk of newly created 20715 posts we were left in the lurch with a paltry number of posts in the level of ACIT.
- Promotions could not be clinched for all posts at one go
- and worse of all, the IRS Association safeguarded the interest of their future members by pentafurcation of ACIT vacancies.

The so called attempts of CHQ were so late that it could not undo the damage inflicted upon us. There was not a single agitation against the attempt of CDBT to damage our career prospects. **When all the units with their limited resources were trying to rope in the support of ministers and members of parliament, you were busy in framing some of the units of your own organization.**

Before crying hoarse about disunity and pinning the blame on JCA, WB, please do remember that you only lent a deaf ear when 3 CCIT/DGIT charges were diverted from our region; 23 posts of CsIT including two administrative CsIT taken out of the state; not a single post out of 7051 posts were given to us in 2006; several Addl.CsIT posts were transferred from West Bengal charge. But after all these, we took the entire blow organizationally rather than blaming other units or individuals. Unity is not a figment of imagination but requires serious effort, understanding and a sense of fellow feeling. You have quoted Tagore but you have not been able to realize his words "*You can't cross the sea merely by standing and staring at the water*"- you need the courage and willingness to get drowned in the process.

But what is most **demoralizing** about the present circular is that **a plain reading of the same suggests that all is well in other sub-committee reports! So the most crucial change proposed is completely overlooked** due to your preoccupation with your brazen attempt to rope other units against WB unit. **If we allow to replace the word 'vacancy' by 'recruitment' under Rule 7(2) & 7(3) of proposed in IRS Recruitment Rule, the career prospect of 80% of our members will be sealed forever.** All our efforts, persuasion & PR done so far in response to CRC notification will go in vain. Because even if the entire 1459 posts of ACIT are allowed to be filled up by promotion, we will be at the mercy of CDBT in respect of matching direct recruitment quota and it will take several years to fill up all the vacancies, jeopardizing the career prospect of the ITOs further. **Unfortunately such an important issue didn't get a slightest mention in the circular. Or did the CHQ find solace in mere mentioning of a note of dissent in the report?**

For a more detailed and expansive reading of the issues arising out of these recommendations, as well as from those of other subcommittees, please also peruse the annexure enclosed.

Comradely Yours

Sd/-

(Bhaskar Bhattacharya)
General Secretary

Annexure.

Before we go into the flaws of the reports of various sub-committees, we must express our disappointment in a letter like this from CHQ which is intended to be circulated at this juncture when the Organization has achieved exactly nothing in last so many years. On one hand you talk about the centrifugal forces unleashed by the recommendations of Sub-committee No.1 and on the other you single out some state units and vilify their members based on false statistics in a time when we are fighting against an injustice and without any help from CHQ. Is the CHQ playing the same trick of the British colonialist's *divide and rule policy*? **During the last three All India BGMs we have witnessed that the leadership at the helm of affairs trying to gloss over their total failure by dangling the bait of a much delayed promotion order just before the BGM in order to sail through the elections. This time with no promotion order in the horizon and after ensuring the future career prospects of all our members, especially ITOs, are damaged to the maximum, the parochial passions are being flamed once again in order to cross the election hurdle in the ensuing BGM.**

Now, going back the issue of stagnation in the grade of ITI in general, we believe this should primarily be the concern of ITEF and not that of ITGOA. However, **I ITGOA, WB unit, had proposed stagnation as one of the criteria in the submission sent to the Sub-committee No.1, for devising a formula for deployment additional manpower. On the contrary, we observed a shocking silence on the part of our representative in the Sub-committee No.1 on this issue.**

After the representatives of ITGOA and ITEF were inducted into different sub committees, ITEF CHQ organised number of meetings in their different forums, collected information from all units, formed a core group to study the same and devised the deployment formula after long debates, which was placed before the sub-committee. The sub-committee report indicates that the ITEF made its presence felt on every issue, irrespective of clinching it or not. ITGOA, CHQ simply failed to rise to the occasion. The inputs of the CHQ on those issues, decided in core-committee meeting, were either not shared or shared too late in our official website. Our representative in sub-committee no.1 was supposed to raise all these in the sub- committee **meetings but mention of that finds no place in the final report and minutes of various meetings.** With heavy heart we see the CHQ has now donned the role of administration and trying to justify the recommendations of the sub committee-1, instead of advising the state units.

A. FLAWS IN THE REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE-1 :-

1. Curtailment: It may be emphasized that the Committee's sole function was to determine the distribution of **newly created 20,751 additional posts** arising out of CRC 2013 with a view to increase the effective functioning of the department. However, to our surprise on perusal of the report of the Committee No-1 submitted before the CBDT on 30.11.2013, we find a **substantial cut** in the number of posts against the **existing sanctioned strength** in the cadre of DCIT/ACIT, AO Gr.III, P.S, Executive Assistant, N.S and MTS. in WB region.

While most of the other regions were blessed with additional manpower in all or at least most of the cadres, the West Bengal Region has been singled out for all round curtailment in manpower. The table

below will indicate that the number of posts allotted to us are far below that proposed in the formula of ITEF(CHQ), in fact is much below the sanctioned strength, at present.

Sl No.	Cadre Name	Sanctioned strength at present	New staff strength as per recommendations of committee No.1	Change	Change in staff strength as per ITEF formula
1	CCIT	12	9	(-)3	Nil
2.	CIT	68	80	12	28
3.	ADDL.CIT	128	126	(-)2	17
4.	DCIT/ACIT	220	190	(-)30	20
5.	ITO/TRO	477	540	63	97
6.	PR.AO A.O GR-II A.O GR-III	108	118	8	32
7.	SR Ps PS	110	89	(-)21	(-)3
8.	ITI	900	1130	230	238
9.	EA	2196	1651	(-)545	275
10.	TA	1242	1266	24	183
11.	N.S	553	367	(-)186	16
12.	MTS	1010	972	(-)38	247
	Total	7024	6539	(-)485	1150

From the above table it becomes clear that instead modest expectation of 16.37% increase in manpower following the cadre Restructuring 2013 we have been handed a 6.9% reduction from the existing staff strength. When the number of assessment units in this region is increasing, the curtailment of staff down the level will adversely affect the tax administration which is already reeling under huge shortage of manpower.

2. Overstepping of mandate: Again the sub-committee no. 1 was given the specific mandate, *inter alia*, other issues to recommend the Regions/Charges/ places where **the additional posts/officers/officials** can be deployed and their likely jurisdiction keeping in mind the need.[Page7; Para 3]. But on perusal of the recommendations made by the sub-committee, we are sorry to note that it **exceeded its brief** on the question of tinkering with existing staff strength.

The sub-committee adopted *Consolidated Manpower Approach* when they were mandated to strictly adhere to *Incremental Manpower Approach*. Out of three reasons shown by them for the above sighted aberration is while deciding on the formula for manpower distribution the maximum emphasis was given to existing distorted organizational hierarchy caused due to diversion of posts of CIT and higher ups leaving behind the corresponding supporting staff. Unfortunately, this argument falls flat as *Consolidated Manpower Approach* seems to be adding more distortion instead of addressing it. The faulty approach adopted thus reduces a beneficial exercise like CRC into a farce [Page 12; Para14].

While describing their approach towards CCIT wise manpower deployment, it was suggested in the following manner: *In case of regions, where the computed allocation is lower than or equal to the existing allocation, the existing allocation was proposed. In appropriate situations, redeployment of posts within CCA was suggested. In exceptional conditions, additional posts greater than computed or existing allocation would be proposed to address the specific requirements of a region or to account for relative stagnation.*[Page 13; Para 17 (iii)(d)] . In reality, this has been followed in case of deployment of posts only at the level of Pr. CIT, but completely ignored for the posts down on the line. The failure cost this charge loss of 485 posts from the Addl. CIT/JCIT level upto MTS.

3. Irrelevance of adopted parameters: While deciding over the parameters to be adopted for allocation of the posts of the Pr. CIT, the sub-committee has categorically assured the staff side that that *....this would not lead to greater allocation of posts than necessary to revenue yielding regions as compared to other regions*". However the final outcome of manpower allocation shows the sub committee has failed to keep their promise. Whatever may be the parameters and their corresponding weighthages adopted, the final allocation figures become to directly proportional to Revenue Collection [Page 25; Para 65]

One of the reasons cited by the Department for obtaining the nod of the Cabinet is to raise the scrutiny workload to 2% of the existing number of assessees. Moreover, the CRC will be implemented in the coming years. On this ground, selection of the scrutiny workload as on 31.03.2013 cannot not be accepted as a parameter. The cases selected for scrutiny in F.Y. 12-13 will be barred by limitation on 31.03.2014, by the time implementation of CRC is not likely to be completed[Page26-27;Para 70].

That's why we proposed the formula as follows: Budget (Revenue) – 20%; Workload (no. of asseses): 55%; Stagnation: 15% and Mufossil Stations : 10%. The formula so devised was to overcome the shortcomings of subcommittee adopted formula in a scientific and comprehensive manner. For example even the CBDT has admitted flaws in CASS selection process and invited opinion from field formation for effective selection. Again most of the large tax paying asseses are PSUs and where they will file their return is absolutely a political decisions, thus tilting revenue collection figure to any particular region.

4. Stagnation a pretext: While deciding on allocation of the posts of Pr. CIT, the sub-committee observed as under: *If posts remained thereafter they could be allotted to Jaipur, Lucknow and Patna regions which were facing acute stagnation in staff cadres.* But when the proposal of including stagnation as a parameter with 15% weightage was considered by the sub-committee, it was specifically observed that “.... Hence, there was no need to adopt stagnation as a standard criterion for distribution of posts. The only issue that remained was the distribution of posts in a manner that relative stagnation of cadres in various regions was also addressed.”. If the criterion of stagnation was adopted as a parameter, the relative position across the charges has to be discussed in detail. [Page-42 ; Para-125]

We are not averse to allocation of additional posts to other states on the basis of stagnation but doing this on personal whims and fancies avoiding proper discussion and quoting irrelevant facts and figures from the reports of the various CCsIT(CCA), this ad-hoc should have been avoided.

5. Diversion of CC/CIT posts have a direct effect on staff allocation: The sub-committee has all along tried to impress upon that any diversion of posts at the level of the CCIT will not have any impact on the lower posts. But when the final allocation is out, we find that our apprehension comes true. Diversion of posts at upper level during pre CRC period and due to CRC appears to be directly proportional for lower posts. This charge is going to lose posts in lower level substantially along with diversion of CCIT posts as per recommendation. [Page-44; Para- 131].

6. Reduction in ranges: While allocating ranges, the existence of six additional ranges (due to diversion of 2 CIT posts earlier) has completely been ignored. As a result we lost these six ranges in sub-committee recommendation. Interestingly, it is remarked against the reduction in no. of ranges as “to be redeployed”. [Table-14; Page-48]. But nowhere in the report the reason for said redeployment is found. Allocation of 6 Special ranges was recommended by the sub-committee for this charge [Table 16; Page-50]. But in the final allocation table, the allocation of special range is shown as 5 instead of proposed 6.

7. Disparity in distribution of Inv Posts: In the report, the sub committee recommended for an additional post of DIT(Inv.) in Karnataka. Both Karnataka and West Bengal charge are allocated with 5 Inv ranges. When the demand of Addl. DIT post has been accepted in the case of Karnataka, the same was denied to West Bengal (with a remark *not possible*). Also the suggestion of JCA(WB) to increase the number of officers and staffs for I&CI wing, especially in the border districts has been totally ignored which will seriously affect the dissemination of huge number of information available with the department.

8. The Puppet’s voice?: CHQ is found to start humming the tune of direct recruits regarding importance of Revenue in manpower deployment. You may recall from the minutes of several CRC, COS and GOM meetings (collected through RTI route and shared) that our the then Chairperson and her battery of experts (who are now showing their wisdom in various sub committees and core committee) appeared to be simply clueless while trying to establish the need of additional manpower for collection of revenue before the IAS fraternity/DOPT and showcased all other issues except revenue collection as justification. Once the nod was accorded by the cabinet, they changed their stripes and started singing the revenue collection tune. Even apparently nonexistent WB unit of IRS Association filed a submission before local implementation committee and later before the sub committee no 1 proposing manpower

deployment strictly on the basis of revenue collection. That submission also appeared to be drafted by their highest leadership. To our greatest shock, we are now hearing humming of the same tune from our CHQ.

9. Double speak of the CBDT: It is a known fact that requirement of posts was proposed based on actual requirement of the Department as on 2013-14. However, to accommodate desires of Direct Recruit officers, the sub committee has proposed various changes to suit their needs. While doing so, it has observed as under:

“ the Sub-committee decide to modify the norms proposed in the Cadre restructuring report for meeting the new functional requirements and optimal utilization of resources [Para 34; Page 18].”

Based upon the above observation, the sub-committee liberated itself from all obligations and decided to modify significantly even the allocation of CCIT posts [CCIT(IT), CCIT(Exemption) & CCIT(IT)] and other posts proposed and notified by the CBDT. Also, the sub- committee has proposed to earmark some Pr. CIT charges for allocating among other administrative CIT charges whereas some administrative CIT charges are to be manned by CIT (SAG Grade) though the core committee had specifically intimated them not to tweak with Pr. CIT charges. In such a situation, it sounds strange when the sub-committee in their report has repeatedly expressed their helplessness in various occasions to do justice in deployment of ACIT/DCIT against crucial posts due to severe shortage in ACIT/DCIT posts. Even at times, they thought it as compromise to place ITOs in place of ACIT/DCIT for various posts due to acute shortage.

It is worthy to mention here that while we are demanding our quota of posts, we were made to believe that notifications made by the CBDT are sacrosanct, as they were prepared following the Cabinet Note and cabinet approval there off . This argument was previously offered for staggered promotions in the post of ACIT, however it is amply clear from the above discussions that the so called cabinet note or cabinet approved for cadre deployment can be bent at will to suit the interest of the Direct Recruits, but the same will be put as a tool to block promotion in all ACIT vacancies.

10. Creation and allocation of posts of Sr. PPS: It is stated that the highest grade in PS cadre will be Sr. PPS at 6600 GP in PB 3[Para 283 Page 106]. Naturally they should cater Pr CCIT/CCIT. But there is no mention of such post in Table 55 (at Page 107). It is more striking that **116** posts have been created in the AO Cadre in same garde {**Pr AO; GP 6600-PB 3**}, not a single such post is created in PS Cadre (Sr PPS) to cater all the Pr CCIT/CCIT.

We should therefore strongly place our demand of releasing all ACIT posts in one go for promotion exposing the CBDT's bluff on cabinet note.

11 Diversion of post of CIT, Burdwan: The post of CIT, Burdwan has been proposed to be diverted on a factually incorrect figure of no. of assessee's which was taken at 51,000 whereas the correct figure is at 94,933 excluding e-filed returns.

(B) Sub Committee No. 5: IRS Recruitment Rule:

i) **Rule 2(a):** 'Organized Group A Service' term proposed to be incorporated specifically despite the fact that it has already been reckoned as "Organized Group A Service". Hence one time relaxation in quota rule (for the vacancies in the grade of ACIT due to CRC exercise) should not pose a threat to the IRS Cadre regarding its 'Organized Group A Service' status as per DOPT's O.M. dated 19.11.2009. [Note below para 1(vi)]. Hence the alibi for rejecting the claim doesn't stand.

ii). **Rule 7(2) & 7(3):** Word 'Recruitment' is kept instead of 'Vacancy', thus allowed to play in the hands of CBDT. If full quota of direct recruit vacancy is not filled up by CBDT, legitimate promotion of the promotees may easily be denied. Mere mention of ITGOA's note of dissent doesn't make any sense for us. This change will seal our career prospect for ever and we have to block such a move at any cost.

iii). **Rule 12 :** No scope for bunching left. If the proposed rule read in conjunction with Rule 7(2) & 7(3), it will again suggest that no excess promotions will be provided to promote officers in any circumstances. This fortification in favour of direct recruit officers clearly shows the malice towards the promote officers and will jeopardize the issue further.

iv) **Rule 14(1) :** Provision for probation of two years for promotee officers also in the grade of ACIT appears infructuous because probation is to be followed by confirmation, which is infructuous for a promote officer, who has long been confirmed.

v) **Rule 14(4) (b) :** Tenure of training for promote officers is kept in the discretion of the authority, even no minimum period of tenure suggested, like that in existing IRS RR.

(C) Sub Committee 6 :

(i)**ITO** :- Mandatory Training just after promotion along with postponement of increment clause may be problematic; should have some flexibility to fix the tenure and timing for nomination [Para 3.4; Page10] Strange enough that in the similar situation, no such provision is proposed in IRS Recruitment Rule [Rule 12(6)] that too for a new entrant.

(ii)**Pr. A.O. :** - It is in PB-3 [GP-6600], so how the seniority will be fixed? Will it be CCA wise or all India basis? [Para 4.1; Page 11].

(iii)**A.O.:-** Qualifying departmental examination proposed, whereas it was opposed by the Association. Their job profile simply does not warrant such examination [Para 4.3.2; Page 12].

(iv) **Sr. P.P.S. :-** It is observed that *"the Sub-committee noted that the recommendation of the Cadre restructuring committee regarding the creation of posts at the level of Sr. PPS (PB3, GP-6600) and PPS (PB3, GP-5400) was not accepted by the Government[Para-5; Page-13]*

But had those posts been ever proposed by the CBDT? Following the line of the Post of Pr. A.O., at least creation of post in the grade of Sr. PPS must be demanded. Otherwise officers in Sr. PS cadre have to cater the officers of the grades of HAG, HAG+ and Apex scales, which is unheard of in any other Central Government Department.

(v) P.S. – Successful completion of Secretarial Practice Training is set as pre-condition; but it was opposed by the Association. However, it is said that ITEF is agreeing to the proposal {Para- 5.2.2; Page 15]

(D) Sub Committee 7:

(i) Project Tarang: Para 3.1; Page -31- In case of Landline, performance of Project Tarang not discussed. This opportunity should be utilized to review Project Tarang performance and bring BSNL/MTNL to task.

(ii) Mobile Set- Only sets for SAG onwards officers are discussed. What about proposed Handset supply to all staff members?

(iii) Datacard: No mention of allotting the same to AO/PS or Post 2008 ITOs.

(iv) Laptop:- Para 4.3: No mention of Laptops for AO/PS or Post 2008 ITOs.

The Sub Committee observed as under: **“4.3.3 Revision of existing norms for laptops :** There has been a long standing demand from staff associations for providing laptops to Administrative officers, Inspectors, PS and Senior PS. The proposal for providing laptops to Inspectors under the 1% incentive scheme has been “in principle” approved by CBDT on grounds of functionality. However, the IFU has raised objections on this proposal which are being looked into by DGIT (Admn.). **The proposal for providing laptops to Administrative officers, senior PS and PS has also been “in principle” approved by the CBDT in the Board meeting on 02-07-2013. However, the IFU has raised objections on this proposal which are being looked into by the Directorate of Infrastructure.”**

It is unfortunate that despite repeated reminders and submissions, the above issue simply shuttling among various wings of CBDT/DOR namely DG(HRD), DI(Infra), IFU etc. and is needed to have been effectively taken up. **It is amazing that this prestigious issue of getting principle approval for laptops in the case of AO/PS cadres is intimated only after the publication of sub-committee report and our CHQ did not bother to collect and circulate the information in last 5 months.**