15

25

# 1987 January 7 (STYLIANIDES J.)

# IN THE MATTER OF ARTICLE 146 OF THE CONSTITUTION ANDREAS D KALAFATIS

Applicant

٧

## **ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY OF CYPRUS**

Respondent

(Case No 521/85)

Legitimate interest—Principles applicable—Public Corporations—Promotions— Applicant challenging promotion to a post two grades higher than the one he holds and not possessing required qualifications for sub judice post— Applicant does not possess a legitimate interest

5 Fublic Corporations—Promotions—Electricity Authority of Cyprus—Joint Advisory Selection Committee set up in accordance with regulations made in pursuance to a Collective Agreement made between the respondent Authority and the Union of its employees participating in the process of promotion—Regulations neither approved by the Council of Ministers not published in the Official Gazette—Regulations invalid—Subjudice decision annulled

Public Corporations—Personnel matters—Electricity Authority of Cyprus—The Electricity Development Law Cap 171—Constitution stripped off Authority of all its powers thereunder as regards personnel matters—The Public Corporations (Regulation of Personnel Matters) Law 61/70—Section 3—Absence of rules or regulations governing the exercise of the power thereunder—Authority lacks competence to exercise such powers

Collective agreements—Do not create rights or obligations in public law

The applicant who is a Clerk 1st Grade in the service of the respondents challenges by means of this recourse the promotion of interested parts.

Kourouniades to the post of section Head in the department of commercial services and the promotion of interested party Kassardjian to the post of Deputy Section Head in the department of legal Services.

The post of section Head is two grades higher than the post held by the applicant and moreover the applicant did not possess the required qualifications for promotion to such post under the relevant scheme of service. The applicant, however possessed the necessary qualifications for promotion to the post of Deputy Section Head.

loint Advisory Selection Co ade under clause 24(1) (c) of en the Authority and the U the respondents, who approved by the Council of	he process of taking of the sub judice decisions immittee, formed in accordance with regulations of the Collective Agreement 1974-75, made bet finion of its employees, participated, but counsel admitted that such regulations were neither Ministers nor published in the Official Gazette, the Committee was not such as to taint the final	5
id post of Section Head an isst of Deputy Section Head by be examined by the Co sence of an express provis	arse as regards the sub judice promotion to the d annulling the sub judice promotion to the said (1) The issue of an applicant's legitimate interest urt ex proprio motu. It is well settled that in the ion to the contrary no officer may be promoted time, moreover, the applicant in this case did not	10
ns for promotions - in the neme of service qualification	e, the last day for the submission of the applica- is case 13 10 84, the required by the relevant ions for promotion to the said post of Section cant lacks legitimate interest to challenge the sub	15
The regulations setting ralid (Kofteros v EAC) (85) 3 C L R 458) The Condation of the said Comm	t does not create rights or obligations in public up the Joint Advisory Committee are plainly 1985) 3 C L R 394 and <i>Antoniades v E A C</i> ourt is unable to say to what extent the recommittee influenced the final act of promotion. It foliotion to the post of Deputy Section Head has to	20 25
d the Authority of all power 1 with regard to personnel 2 emergency situation and 3 Public Service Commiss acted the Public Corporat but the powers under s 3 2 requisites provided by lan	ther ground of annulment. The Constitution strip- ers under the Electricity Development Law, Cap matters (appointments, promotions etc.) Due to the vacuum created by the non functioning of sion envisaged by the Constitution, there was ions (Regulation of Personnel Matters) Law 61/ 8 thereof cannot be validly exercised, unless the w are complied with. As no rules or regulations ercise of such power, the respondents could not in the matter.	30 35
	Recourse against sub judice promotion to the post of Section Head in the Department of commercial services dismissed Sub judice promotion to the post of Deputy Head in the Department of legal service annulled No order as to costs	40

### Cases referred to:

Constantinou v. The Republic (1974) 3 C.L.R. 416;

Kritiotis v. The Municipality of Paphos and others (1986) 3 C.L.R. 322:

Paraskevopoulou v. The Republic (1980) 3 C.L.R. 647;

5 Meletis and Others v. Cyprus Ports Authority (1986) 3 C.L.R. 418;

Arkatitis v. The Republic (1967) 3 C.L.R. 429;

Tryfon v. The Republic (1968) 3 C.L.R. 28;

The Republic and Another v. Aristotelous (1982) 3 C.L.R. 497;

The Republic v. Pericleous and Others (1984) 3 C.L.R. 577;

Mavrommatis and Others v. Land Consolidation Authority (1984) 3 C.L.F 1006;

Kofteros v. E.A.C. (1985) 3 C.L.R. 394;

Antoniades v. E.A.C. (1985) 3 C.L.R. 458.

#### Recourse.

- Recourse against the decision of the respondents to promote the interested parties to the posts of Section Head and Deputy Section Head in the Departments of Legal Services and Commercial Services in preference and instead of the applicant.
  - P. Angelides, for the applicant.
- 20 E. Liatsou (Mrs.) for G. Cacoyiannis for the respondent.

Cur. adv. vuli

STYLIANIDES J. read the following judgment. The applicant is Clerk, 1st Grade, in the service of the respondents.

- On 28.9.84 the respondents advertised the posts of Deputs 25 Section Head in the department of legal services and Section Head in the department of commercial services. They are promotion posts. Applications should have reached the Director of Personnel not later than 13.10.84. The applicant submitted applications for both posts.
- The respondents on 19.2.85 promoted to the post of Section Head Marios Kourouniades and to the post of Deputy Section Head Garbis Kassardjian who were holders of the posts of Deputy Section Head and Clerk, 1st Grade, respectively.

The applicant, being aggrieved, by means of this recourse seeks he annulment of the aforesaid promotions

The revisional jurisdiction of this Court stems from Article 146 of the Constitution. A person cannot contest before this Court the alidity of any decision, act or omission of any executive or idministrative authority unless he possesses the quality of legitinate interest. Paragraph 2 of Article 146 provides that a recourse nay be made by a person whose any existing legitimate interest, which he has either as a person or by virtue of being a member of a Community, is adversely and directly affected by such decision or act or omission.

10

5

A recourse for annulment requires in respect of an applicant a egitimatio ad causum - (See Fleiner, Administrative Law, 8th Edison, pp 212 and 243, Odent - Contentieux Administratif - Fasicule IV, pp 1280 - 1281 Tsatsos The Recourse for Annulment Before the Council of State, 3rd Edition, p 30)

15

A recourse is not an actio popularis. The interest of a person nust be directly affected by the legal situation he seeks to be inhulled. An applicant does not have the requisite locus standi to ining a recourse for annulment unless he is possessed of a legitinate interest at the time of the filing of the recourse until its deternination. Lack of legitimate interest deprives the Court of the ower and jurisdiction to deal with a recourse.

20

As the matter is one of public law, the presence of an existing rigitimate interest has to be inquired into by an administrative our even ex proprio motu - (Constantinou v The Republic, 1974) 3 C L R 416, Kntiotis v The Municipality of Paphos and Others (1986) 3 C L R 322)

25

Applicants for promotion not possessing the qualifications equired under the relevant scheme of service have no legitimate iterest which was adversely affected by the promotion impugned inditional they are not entitled to contest the validity of such promotion (See inter alia Constantinou v The Republic, (supra), Parasevopoulou v The Republic, (1980) 3 C L R 647, Meletis and Others v Cyprus Ports Authority, (1986) 3 C L R 418)

30

The applicant held and continues to hold the post of Clerk, 1st rade which carries a salary of Scale 7. The post of Deputy Secon Head is hierarchically superior and the salary of such post is

35

the combined Scales of 8-9. The post of Section Head is over that of Deputy Section Head and the salary provided is Scale 10.

It is obvious from the above that the post of Section Head is two grades higher than the post of Clerk. 1st Grade.

It is a well settled principle of administrative law that no officer may be promoted for more than one grade at a time in the absence of express provision to the contrary. This principle was expounded in the case of Arkatitis v. The Republic, (1967) 3 C.L.R. 429, which was ever since followed and applied - (See, inter alia, Andreas Tryfon v. The Republic of Cyprus, through the Public Service Commission, (1968) 3 C.L.R. 28: The Republic and Another v. Aristotelous, (1982) 3 C.L.R. 497).

The applicant in view of the absence of express legislative provision - the scheme of service is part of delegated legislation authorising his promotion by two grades at a time, could not and did not have a legitimate interest.

Another reason for which the applicant has no locus standi in respect of the promotion of interested party Kourouniades to the post of Section Head is that he did not possess the qualifications prescribed in the scheme of service. All paragraphs of the scheme of service (Exhibit «C») for the post of Section Head («Τμηματαρχης») require satisfactory service in the post of Deputy Section Head or in a post of the same scale with analogous duties of a duration of 3-7 years, depending on the academic qualifications of a candidate - (See paragraphs 2 (b) (ii), 2(c) (iii) and Notes 1 and 2)

The applicant is the holder of a degree of the University of Salonica, qualification (a) in paragraph 2 of the scheme of service. This, however, by itself is not sufficient: it must be coupled with satisfactory service of not less than three years, as aforesaid, in the post of Deputy Section Head or in a post with the same salary scale and analogous duties.

According to the jurisprudence of this Court - (The Republic v. Katerina Pericleous and Others (1984) 3 C.L. R. 557) - a candidate for a post advertised must possess the qualifications at the last date for the submission of the applications in this case 13.10 84.

The applicant lacked the qualification of sansfactory service in the post of Deputy Section Head or in a post of the same scale and analogous duties. He was a Clerk 1st Grade receiving the salary

5

30

Scale 7.

For the reasons aforesaid he has no legitimate interest in the decision of the promotion to the post of Section Head of Marios Kourouniades; he has no locus standi and the Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the recourse in respect of this promotion and to that extent the recourse will be dismissed.

The applicant was fully qualified for the post of Deputy Section Head.

It was submitted by the applicant and later by the advocate on his behalf that the sub-judice decision is void and of no effect as it was made under invalid rules or regulations as in the process of the taking of such decision a Joint Advisory Selection Committee, consisting of members of the Authority and of the Trade Union, formed and acting in accordance with regulations made under Clause 24(1) ( $\gamma$ ) of the Collective Agreement, 1974 - 75, between the respondent Authority and the Union, participated, and in the alternative that the promotion was effected without rules or regulations made, as provided by the Public Corporations (Regulation of Personnel Matters) Law, 1970 (No. 61 of 1970).

Counsel for the respondent Authority admitted that regulations for the Joint Advisory Selection Committee were made pursuant to the Collective Agreement, which were neither aproved by the Council of Ministers nor published in the Official Gazette but he argued that the part taken by the Selection Committee is such that did not taint with illegality the sub-judice decision as that Committee simply made recommendations and later a Sub-Committee on matters of personnel of the Authority dealt with the matter and ultimately the Board of the Authority took the sub-judice decision.

A collective agreement does not create rights or obligations in public law - (Georghios Mavrommatis and Others v. Land Consolidation Authority, (1984) 3 C.L.R. 1006).

The respondents in arriving at the sub-judice decision took into consideration, inter alia, the «common suggestions» and «the common document» of the Selection Committee established under the aforesaid regulations. I am unable to say to what extent this recommendation influenced the Authority in reaching the sub-judice decision. The regulations setting up the said Committee are plainly invalid - (Kofteros v. Electricity Authority of Cyprus (1985)

3 C.L.R. 394; Pantelis Antoniades v. Electricity Authority of Cyprus (1985) 3 C.L.R. 458).

For these reasons the sub-judice decision for the promotion of interested party Garbis Kassardjian to the post of Deputy Section

5 Head will be annulled

There is a further reason for annulment. The respondent Authority with the coming into operation of the Constitution of the Republic was stripped off of all power vested in it with regard to personnel matters, appointment, promotion, etc., of officers or 10 servants of the Authority which vested in it by the Electricity Development Law, Cap 171 Due to the emergency and the vacuum that resulted from the non-functioning of the Public Service Commission envisaged by the Constitution and the establishment by Law No 33/67 of a Public Service Commission with jurisdic-15 tion limited to the civil service proper, the Public Corporations (Regulation of Personnel Matters) Law, 1970 (No. 61 of 1970) was enacted Section 3 thereof conferred on the Authority power to appoint, confirm appointment, emplace personnel, promote, transfer, etc. This power cannot be validly exercised unless the 20 prerequisites provided by the Law are complied with Nonconformity with the empowering provisions of the Law renders any decision taken invalid

As no rules or regulations were made governing the exercise of such power, the Authority could not validly exercise competence and the sub-judice decision is null and void

It is with satisfaction that the Court noted that the respondents issued the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (Conditions of Service) Regulations, 1986, which, after approval by the Council of Ministers and the House of Representatives, were published in the Official Gazette of 27 12 86 Supplement No 3, page 897

For the aforesaid reasons the recourse against the promotion of Marios Kourouniades to the post of Section Head is hereby dismis sed and the decision of the promotion of interested party Garbis Kassardjian to the post of Deputy Section Head is declared null and void and of no effect whatsoever

Let there be no order as to costs.

Promotion of interested party Kassardjian annulled. Recourse against interested party Kourouniades dismissed. No order as to costs.

5