**JOINT COUNCIL OF ACTION**

INCOME TAX EMPLOYEES FEDERATION &

INCOME TAX GAZETTED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Kerala Unit

No.3/PCCIT/15-16 Dated: 17-12-2015

To

The Principal Chief Commissioner of Income Tax,

Kerala

Sir,

Sub: Objections to guidelines for Biometric Attendance System issued on 07/12/2015 – reg.

 Ref: F. No. CC-CHN/PR/GEN-27/2015-16

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 We would like draw the attention of the Pr. CCIT to the guidelines referred to above. At the very onset we place on record our deep resent on the arbitrary and unilateral manner in which the guidelines were framed as no discussion was caused with the recognized organizations in this matter. In this connection we also bring to the notice of the Pr. CCIT the decisions taken by JCA of ITGOA and ITEF in this matter.

 1] Clause 14 insists upon maintenance of the manual registers under the pretext that the Government has not issued any instructions to do away with the practice. It has to be pointed out that the Government has not issued any instruction to continue with the practice as well. In fact the Government in its guideline has stated “The Government organizations shall be responsible for maintaining the devices installed in their premises and will be responsible for smooth day-to-day functioning of the Bio-metric Attendance terminals.” **Hence, both ITGOA and ITEF have advised our members not to sign any registers simultaneously with the AEBAS system.**

 2] Vide clause 12, employees and officers are required to sign in a register maintained at the reception in the event the machine is faulty. In this connection too we would like to point out that the Officers were not required to sign any registers hitherto. Also, the employees were only required to sign the registers maintained by the controlling officers. The instruction specifies a model register wherein the register is to be signed by specifying time and also both at arrival and departure. This is a clear case of introduction of a parallel system of attendance for which there is no instruction from the Government. Also, in most offices the reception is being manned by private security personnel before whom the Officers and Employees has to form a queue to mark their attendance which is otherwise done on sufficient number of machines installed. **Hence, the JCA has decided not to cooperate with any parallel system of attendance unless and until the matter is discussed with both the organizations and an amicably viable option is agreed upon.**

 3] It is unfortunate that most of the decisions which directly affect the members of JCA are taken without causing any meaningful discussions with the constituents. This is not singular to the AEBAS instruction. We have been demanding to convene PGRC meeting for quite some time. However, for some unknown reason the administration is reluctant to cede to the demand in spite of specific instruction from the CBDT in this regard. Also is a point of concern is the constitution of a committee to draft the transfer guidelines which is proposed to be subjected to discussion with the JCA constituents. The administration bizarrely found it prudent to keep out promotee officers from the committee which is entrusted to formulate a transfer guideline primarily for the transfer and posting of promotee officers and employees. All the above situations are indicators of a penchant for arbitrariness, which has a potential to disrupt the existing peace and harmony within the Department, becoming prevalent in the administration.

 In view of the above, we request you to hold discussion with the JCA on all matters affecting the JCA constituents and demand for an immediate PGRC meeting.

 Yours faithfully

M. Harishkumar A. G. Narayan Hari

 Joint Convenors