



CEC/TPR-POL/2017/02

July 11, 2017

The Member (ANS)
Airports Authority of India
Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 003

Irregularities in Annual Transfers 2017

Dear Sir,

Kindly refer our letter CEC/TPR-POL/2017/01, dated 14th March 2017, wherein the Guild had requested the Management to scrupulously adhere to the Transfer Policy while affecting the Annual Transfers for the year 2017 (Copy attached). It is disheartening to see that despite our requests / suggestions there are many deviations from the transfer policy and many contradictions give us an impression of arbitrariness. First of all, the publication of the list has been inordinately delayed and secondly the 'pick and choose' approach in some cases has created resentment amongst ATCOs under order of transfer including promotion and transfer.

It is evident from the transfer lists in various grades that there is a complete mix up in the concept of normal promotions and promotion with transfers. Normally, the posts should be filled up through DPC for the posts and stations in which sanctioned strength exists. It appears, *prima facie*, that the ATM Directorate does not maintain the station-wise sanctioned strength and the postings are made arbitrarily. For example, a station like Cochin has 10 Jt. GMs / DGMs, and NIATAM has 5 Jt. GMs/DGMs for which sanctioned strength is much less.

It is a practice to bring back the officer to parent station on completion of his / her tenure posting unless otherwise requested by the individual. The violations are visible and representations have been received from the individuals in this regard.

There have been several exemptions, in fact, more than 50 under '**Operational Requirements**'. This concept has been grossly misused. How can somebody working in RNFC for years be given exemption under this clause? Or for that matter, at smaller stations the individuals have been retained in the name of DMS. These are definitely malicious in nature and do not reflect transparent functioning.

Exempting officers from transfer due to Children(s) Education Ground is in accordance with the transfer policy. However, it is observed that in some cases the CEG has been considered and the transfers have been cancelled conveniently so that there is no impact in subsequent years. In other cases, the transfers have been deferred for the year. This issue was discussed last year and anomalies were pointed out. ATC Guild (India) demands that the transfers under CEG should be either cancelled or deferred and the unequal treatment made (even last year) shall be corrected.

The person who got deferment from going to 2 or 3 year station shall not be given a 1 year station. They shall be posted to the same station of posting for same duration as was assigned earlier, to discourage such people from asking for deferment. It is a racket to get exemption by hook or crook so that in subsequent years they get a station of their choice or a station of lesser duration.

On perusal of the representations, the Guild has found that the protests against the transfer lists were genuine. The transfers smacks of favouritism towards a few individuals on illogical and unjustifiable grounds. In many cases where representations had been received, the established Transfer Policy had been violated and thereby whimsical transfers have resulted.

ATC Guild (India) requests your good office to intervene and make suitable corrections to the incorrect transfers and instil confidence in the minds of the officers engaged in a safety critical profession.

Assuring you of our best cooperation at all times.

With regards,



(D K Behera)
General Secretary

Encl. : As stated