

Apex Court held that ordinarily, the term of deputation should not be curtailed except on grounds of unsuitability or unsatisfactory performance and a decision taken in a post haste manner also indicates malice though deputationist might not have any indefeasible right to hold the said post :

"32. Ordinarily, a deputationist has no legal right to continue in the post. A deputationist indisputably has no right to be absorbed in the post to which he is deputed. However, there is no bar thereto as well. It may be true that when deputation does not result in absorption in the service to which an officer is deputed, no recruitment in its true import and significance takes place as he is continued to be a member of the parent service. When the tenure of deputation is specified, despite a deputationist not having an indefeasible right to hold the said post, ordinarily the term of deputation should not be curtailed except on such just grounds as, for example, unsuitability or unsatisfactory performance. But, even where the tenure is not specified, an order of reversion can be questioned when the same is mala fide. An action taken in a post haste manner also indicates malice."

read HERE [2005 PLRonline 0002](#)
