



राष्ट्र हित

विभाग हित

अधिकारी हित

All India Graduate Engineers & Telecom Officers Association

Central Headquarter, New Delhi
(The Recognised Association of BSNL)



Regn. no. HR/019/2018/02138

(Affiliated to BMS)

President

G Veerabhadra Rao
9440648648

General Secretary

Ravi Shil Verma
8373967633

Finance Secretary

Yogendra Jharwal
9414000877

All communication at E-mail - "chqaigetoa@gmail.com" only

AIGETOA / 2026-27/58

Dated 17.09.2026

To,
Shri Amit Agrawal Ji,
Secretary (Telecom), GoI
Sanchar Bhawan, 20, Ashoka Road
New Delhi - 110001.

Subject: Systematic dismantling of established HR processes in BSNL and serious violations of established HR procedures in BSNL in handling of Transfer & Posting matters - request for immediate CVO/DoT Vigilance inquiry, restoration of due process and fixation of responsibility on officers responsible.

Respected Sir,

We are constrained to bring to your kind notice the serious and continuing deterioration in the manner in which Transfer & Posting and other HR matters are being handled in BSNL.

The issue is no longer confined to an individual transfer order or an isolated administrative lapse. **There are repeated instances where established procedures are being bypassed, representations of executives are being kept pending for months, transparent mechanisms are being discontinued without any reason being communicated and consequential actions are being taken without following the prescribed procedure. There appears to be a systematic breakdown of established HR processes in BSNL.**

Such a manner of functioning has created a situation where the established HR policies and procedures are being applied differently in different cases. Executives are being left uncertain about their rights and the manner in which their representations will be considered. This is a matter of serious concern in a public sector organization like BSNL, where personnel administration is required to be governed by approved policies, uniform procedures and transparent decision-making.

AIGETOA has consistently raised such issues with the BSNL Management through the appropriate channels and has always preferred resolution through discussion and established mechanisms rather than confrontation or litigation. However, despite repeated representations and discussions, the situation has not improved. On the contrary, fresh instances of deviation from the established procedure are coming to light.

In view of the seriousness and recurring nature of these issues, **we request the Department of Telecommunications (DOT) to have the entire matter examined independently at an appropriate level, including through CVO, BSNL and/or DoT Vigilance and to fix responsibility wherever violations or lapses are established.**

1. ERP Struck-Off: Violation of the Established Procedure

The recent ERP struck-off exercise is a serious example of departure from the established procedure. The Corporate Office guidelines regarding relieving action through the ERP system, issued vide Letter No. CIT/8-2/2015/ERP Rollout/Vol-I dated 21.06.2016, prescribe the established practice of striking off an officer from the ERP system in the A/N of the last day of the month. The procedure was prescribed, inter alia, to avoid difficulties relating to salary preparation, EPF continuity and mismatch in salary schedules.

Despite this specific and existing instruction, executives have reportedly been struck off from ERP on 07.09.2026, in the middle of the month.

The question is why the procedure specifically prescribed by BSNL itself has been ignored. When the organization has already prescribed a mechanism to avoid salary, EPF and other administrative complications, what was the justification for departing from the same procedure?

This aspect requires immediate examination as to who authorized the deviation, under whose approval the ERP struck-off was carried out and what reasons were recorded for such deviation. The matter cannot simply be brushed aside as a routine administrative exercise when the prescribed procedure itself has been disregarded.

2. ERP Struck-Off without formal release orders

The established process of relieving an executive involves **formal communication in advance** from BSNL Corporate Office **indicating the list of executives to be relieved and the effective date of ERP struck-off.** This enables the concerned executive to formally hand over charge and complete the required pre-release formalities.

In the present case, executives were struck off from ERP through SMS communication, without any formal release orders from BSNL Corporate Office. The ERP struck-off was carried out on **07.09.2026**, whereas formal release orders are still awaited as on **16.09.2026**, **putting executives in a great dilemma. They have simply been struck off with no release orders.**

This raises a very basic question: how can an executive be expected to relinquish charge from the present office and join the new place of posting when the formal release order itself has not been issued? An SMS communication cannot substitute a duly authorized formal release order, particularly when such relieving has consequences relating to charge, salary, ERP status, handing/taking over and joining at the new place of posting.

The Department of Telecommunications (DOT) is therefore requested to ascertain:

Who ordered the ERP struck-off? Who approved it? Who authorized the ERP struck-off without formal release orders? Why was the established procedure not followed? The responsibility for such a serious procedural lapse needs to be clearly established.

3. Claim of DOT/Ministry Directions requires verification

When the matter was raised with BSNL Management regarding mid-month ERP struck-off and relieving without following the established procedure, **BSNL Management referred to directions of the Department of Telecommunications (DOT)/Administrative Ministry.**

This position needs to be verified.

We understand that any direction from the Administrative Ministry would essentially be for timely disposal of pending representations and grievances and complete the pending transfer process

in time. Such a direction cannot be interpreted as authorization to bypass the established procedure for relieving executives or to strike them off from the strength of the existing office without completing the prescribed formalities.

The Department of Telecommunications (DOT) is therefore requested to obtain a written clarification from BSNL regarding the exact nature of the directions allegedly relied upon and examine whether the action taken by BSNL was actually covered by any such direction. BSNL Management should not be permitted to attribute its own administrative decisions and procedural lapses to the Administrative Ministry.

We also place on record our strong objection to the practice by BSNL Management to shift the responsibility for decisions taken at BSNL level to higher authorities in DoT/Ministry. Such an approach not only avoids accountability at the BSNL level but also unnecessarily puts the higher authorities at DoT/Administrative Ministry in an unfavorable position before employees.

4. Selective ERP Struck-Off: Transparency and Uniformity need to be examined

It is further reported that the ERP struck-off exercise **has not been implemented uniformly in respect of all similarly placed executives**. The Association has serious concerns regarding the reported selective implementation of the exercise, particularly where certain senior officers and executives working under the HR Head have allegedly remained unaffected.

The Department is therefore requested to specifically examine the **complete ERP struck-off list**, including: executives who were struck off, executives who were not struck off despite being similarly placed, reasons recorded for such exclusion and authority under whose approval such exclusion was made.

It may also be examined whether ERP status of any executive was subsequently restored after being struck off and then later as afterthought struck off again, if so, under whose orders and for what reasons.

It may further be examined why PGM (Admin/Estb.), who has reportedly remained under transfer for more than two years (under transfer since 20.08.2024) has not been relieved while other Senior officers have been relieved.

5. Pending Representations: Employees left without an effective remedy

At the same time as transfer and relieving actions are being implemented, **a large number of representations submitted under the applicable Transfer Policy and as desired through BSNL's own orders are still pending to be disposed off.**

An executive submits a representation under an established provision of the Transfer Policy. However, before the representation is considered and decided by the competent authority, the consequential transfer/relieving action is implemented. In such a situation, the remedy provided under the policy becomes practically meaningless, leaving the affected executive with little option except to approach a court or tribunal.

The treatment of the age criterion is a glaring example. As per the policy, executives aged 56 years and above are eligible for immunity from Inter-Circle Transfer. However, the criterion has reportedly been changed at different stages. It was increased to 58+ while extending exemption from transfer and has now been increased to 59+ while issuing ERP struck-off/release orders.

Such varying application of the criterion raises serious questions regarding uniformity and transparency in implementation of the Transfer Policy.

An HR system should provide an effective mechanism for resolution of employee grievances. It should not create a situation where employees are compelled to seek judicial intervention merely because their representations have not been decided in time.

The Department of Telecommunications is therefore requested to obtain **the complete status of pending representations**, including the date of receipt, nature of representation and action taken thereon, and examine:

Why have such representations not been disposed of within the prescribed/stipulated timeframe? Why are representations even after four months still pending?

The Department may also examine whether any selective dispensation has been extended by the BSNL HR group to particular individuals **based on personal considerations or proximity to Management**.

6. Hard-Tenure Transfer System has been substantially disrupted

The established mechanism for hard-tenure transfers has also been substantially disrupted. **Under the applicable provisions, transfer orders for executives completing their hard tenure are required to be processed three months in advance**, so that the prescribed tenure at difficult stations is not exceeded. However, tenure-completion transfer orders have reportedly been delayed for prolonged periods, in some cases by nearly one year beyond completion of the prescribed tenure. Many people are still waiting for their transfer orders despite completion of their hard tenure period.

At the same time, the established mechanism for **tenure-in postings which used to be as per the waiting list based on OTP seniority, has ceased to function** and now hard tenure orders are being implemented on pick and choose basis **in utter violation of the BSNL's standing instructions on the subject**.

The Department of Telecommunications (DOT) is requested to examine:

1. How many executives have completed the prescribed hard tenure but are still awaiting transfer orders?
2. How many executives have been transferred after substantial delay?
3. Why were transfer orders not issued within the prescribed timeframe?
4. Who was responsible for maintaining the tenure-in waiting list?
5. Why was the established OTP-seniority-based mechanism discontinued or altered?
6. Whether approval of the competent authority was obtained for any such change for the deviation from the standing instructions on the subject?

7. Long-Stay Transfers: Established Transparent mechanism discontinued

The earlier practice of **publishing the long-stay list and inviting choices from executives** provided a transparent mechanism for processing long-stay transfers. Executives were able to know their position and submit their choices accordingly. **This established mechanism has now been discontinued.** Long-stay transfers are reportedly being issued **without publishing the long-stay list and without inviting choices from the affected executives leading to huge unrest and panic amongst employees.** The Association has come across cases where executives are being posted **on a pick-and-choose basis without any transparent criteria being made available to the affected employees.**

The obvious question is:

Why was the established transparent mechanism discontinued?

If any new mechanism has been approved, the Association requests the Department of Telecommunications to **obtain the approval/order under which the earlier mechanism was changed and examine whether the revised procedure is in accordance with the applicable Transfer Policy.**

8. Transfer Policy: Consultation Policy without finalization

A modified Transfer Policy was shared with recognized Unions and Associations in **March 2025**. The stakeholders submitted their suggestions with the expectation that the revised policy would thereafter be finalized and issued. However, **the revised Transfer Policy has remained pending for a prolonged period.** This has created an avoidable situation where **transfers continue to be undertaken even though the revised policy itself has not been finalized.**

Such a situation naturally leads to **different interpretations, disputes and avoidable litigation.**

The Department may kindly ascertain: the present status of the revised Transfer Policy, the reasons for the delay in its finalization, the authority responsible for finalization, whether the suggestions submitted by unions/Associations were properly examined and the likely timeline for finalization and issue of the revised Transfer Policy.

9. Repeated Litigation arising from HR decisions need serious examination

The increasing number of court and tribunal cases arising out of BSNL's transfer and HR decisions cannot be viewed merely as individual employee disputes. Where similar issues repeatedly reach judicial forums, it becomes necessary to examine whether the underlying administrative process itself is functioning properly.

It is understood that in several cases, courts/tribunals have made adverse observations relating to aspects of decision-making or implementation. In certain matters, proceedings have reportedly gone further, including contempt-related proceedings and directions for payment of costs by representatives of Management in their individual capacity.

The Department of Telecommunications is therefore requested to obtain a **consolidated statement of litigation arising from transfer and HR decisions during the relevant period**, containing nature of the dispute, policy involved, decision-making authority, judicial observations, outcome, cost imposed and action taken by BSNL, details of any contempt proceedings; and whether any BSNL officer has been held responsible for contempt or directed to bear costs in his/her personal capacity.

10. HR Administration cannot be run through individual discretion

The Association is deeply concerned that **established HR procedures are increasingly being replaced by individualized decision-making.** An institutional HR system cannot function on the basis of **the personal interpretation, convenience or discretion of an individual officer.**

The Transfer Policy is meant to ensure **uniformity, predictability and transparency.** If the same provision is applied differently in different cases, it defeats the very purpose of having a written policy.

The Department of Telecommunications is therefore requested to **examine whether the Transfer Policy is being implemented uniformly and whether any selective relaxation or dispensation is being extended in individual cases without a transparent and**

recorded basis.

11. Request for CVO/DOT Vigilance inquiry and fixation of responsibility

In view of the **repeated and interconnected nature of the issues highlighted above**, we respectfully but firmly request the Department of Telecommunications to initiate **an independent fact-finding/vigilance examination through the appropriate authority of CVO, BSNL and/or DoT Vigilance** into the handling of Transfer & Posting and related HR matters.

Appropriate responsibility may kindly be fixed on the concerned officer(s)/Decision-Making Authority under the applicable rules wherever any lapse, violation or misconduct is established.

12. Immediate Corrective Measures:

Pending completion of the inquiry, we request the Department of Telecommunications to consider directing BSNL to:

1. Issue formal release orders corresponding to the ERP struck-off exercise immediately.
2. Issue appropriate cancellation orders in respect of cases where exemption/dispensation has already been granted and ensure that the same criteria are applied uniformly to all similarly placed executives. The criteria and approval should be recorded in writing.
3. Review the ERP struck-off exercise for compliance with the applicable ERP instructions.
4. Dispose of all pending representations under the applicable Transfer Policy on priority and within a defined timeframe.
5. Ensure that no employee suffers irreversible prejudice merely because his/her representation is pending before the competent authority.
6. Restore the transparent mechanism for hard-tenure and long-stay transfers.
7. Publish the applicable criteria/lists wherever the established procedure requires such publication.
8. Ensure that every transfer and relieving action is supported by a formal, duly authorized and traceable order.
9. Put in place a time-bound mechanism for disposal of employee representations.
10. Finalize the revised Transfer Policy after proper consideration of the suggestions submitted by unions/recognized Associations.
11. Submit a comprehensive report to the Department of Telecommunications regarding the corrective action taken on the above issues.

The present issue is **not about seeking preferential treatment for any category of employees**. AIGETOA has consistently demanded **uniform application of rules, transparency and adherence to established procedures**. The Association has **no objection to legitimate transfers arising out of administrative or organizational requirements**, provided such transfers are carried out **in accordance with the applicable policy, through a uniform and transparent procedure and after following the prescribed process**.

What is being questioned is the manner in which the established procedure is being applied selectively, changed without transparency and, in several cases, not followed at all.

The continuing uncertainty is adversely affecting employee confidence and industrial relations at a time when BSNL requires a stable and motivated workforce.

We therefore urge the Department of Telecommunications to intervene immediately and ensure that the established HR procedures in BSNL are restored and followed uniformly.

The Department, being the Administrative Ministry, may kindly ensure that HR administration in BSNL remains rule-based and transparent and that no individual officer is allowed to alter or bypass established procedures at his/her discretion.

AIGETOA expects an appropriate and time-bound intervention by the Department of Telecommunications in the matter and an independent examination of the issues raised above, including fixation of responsibility wherever the lapses are established.

With Regards



(Ravi Shil Verma)
General Secretary

Copy to:

- 1. Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia Ji, Hon'ble Minister of Communications & DoNER,** Government of India, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi for kind information.
- 2. Dr. Pemmasani Chandra Sekhar Ji, Hon'ble Minister of State for Communications and RD,** Government of India, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi for kind information.
- 3. Shri K Balaji Ji, JS (Admin),** Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road New Delhi for kind information.
- 4. Shri Surender Kumar Pandey Ji, General Secretary BMS** for kind information.