

government as claimed by the petitioner, because of the right of the minority institution under Art. 30(1) of the constitution of India and the authorities are always empowered to scrutinize the same. They have done so in the case of the 7<sup>th</sup> respondent. By any transfer, the service condition of the transferred staff is no way affected. If at all, if a staff is aggrieved by any anomaly arising due to the said transfer, the said person can approach and redress his/her grievances before the "Grievance Committee", effectively functioning within the 7<sup>th</sup> respondent management. The grounds in clause (c), (d) and (e) are repetitive and hence are liable to be rejected. There is no violation of the Full Bench judgment. The order in the Review Petition has become final.

14. I humbly submit that the claim of the petitioner in clause (f) of the grounds is not only a malafide, but amounts to threatening the authorities, stating that there is contemptuous disobedience to the directions of this Hon'ble Court. The grounds in clause (g) and (h) that the transfers are contrary to the provisions of the Act, is baseless, because the very Act provides for the corporate management to be considered as one unit. The grounds raised in clause (k) that the petitioner are representing the entire staff is totally baseless and is a misrepresentation. The petitioner body is a fringe element of a handful people and self-styled champions of all the staff, who rightfully and for valid reasons keep a distance from this body. The petitioner is a compulsive litigant, filing frivolous petitions because of some personal grievances and for reasons best known to themselves. The competent authorities are not duty bound and so cannot be compelled by the petitioner to give them a hearing, before passing orders within their authority as claimed in clause (k). The petitioner has nothing to do with the same and is a stranger.

we have  
to include  
the matter