

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/020/476/2014

HYDERABAD, this the 20th day of January, 2020

**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**



1. Pingali Prameela,
W/o. P. Adinarayana,
Aged about 47 years,
Occ: Casual Compere/ Announcer/
Production Assistant,
R/o. F.No.403, Vinayaka & Sahitha Abode,
Mahendra Hills, East Maredpally,
Secunderabad - 500 017.
2. S. Soudamini,
W/o. S. Murali,
Aged about 35 years,
Occ: Casual Compere/ Announcer/ Production Asst.,
R/o.303 Siri Residency,
Padma Nagar, Chintal,
Hyderabad - 500 037. Applicants

(By advocate: Mr. Siva for A-1
Mr. D. Suresh Kumar for A-2))

Vs

1. Government of India rep. by
Secretary,
O/o. Information & Broadcasting,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General,
All India Radio,
New Delhi.
3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Prasara Bharathi, PTI Building,
2nd floor, Parliament Street,
New Delhi - 110 001.
4. The Additional Director General,
South Zone, Prasara Bharathi,
All India Radio, Swamy Sivananda Salai,,
Chennai - 600 005.
5. The Station Director,
All India Radio, Saifabad,
Hyderabad - 500 004. Respondents

(By advocate: Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC
Mr. A. Radha Krishna, Sr. PC to CG)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member



None appeared on behalf of the applicants. We have heard the learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The brief facts of the case are that both the applicants have been working in All India Radio as Casual Announcer/ Compere/ Production Assistant from the year 1999 on contract basis. They have been engaged for only six duties in a month during the last 14 years. Till date, they have been given a maximum of 72 duties each in a year and have been getting remuneration accordingly. They have made a representation, which is not found favourable by the respondents and they have approached this Tribunal seeking a direction to absorb them as regular employees in the post suitable to their experience and the required qualification they possess or in the alternative, allot maximum 29 day (duties) in a month as per previous orders issued by Prasar Bharathi, considering their long experience rendered for all these years before completion of regular recruitment (2013-14) and consider regularisation of their services to whatever post they are eligible for.

3. Notices were issued and the respondents filed a detailed reply. It is submitted that the Government has taken a decision to take work from contract employees as per the policy laid down and they are being recruited according to the policy i.e. 72 days in a year and 6 days in a month, irrespective of the nature of duty performed by them.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the respondents, we are of this view that a contract employee has no legal right to approach this Tribunal, for getting regularisation of his services. At best, we can observe that the respondents may continue with the present arrangement till the superannuation of the applicants, as

per the policy. In case their services are not required by the respondents, they may take due course of law and terminate their services.

5. With the above observations, we dispose of this O.A. No order as to costs.



(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
ADMN. MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDL. MEMBER

/pv/