



## Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi

O.A. No.349/2020

M.A. No.445/2020

With

O.A. No.350/2020

M.A. No.444/2020

O.A. No.352/2020

M.A.No.448/2020

O.A. No.356/2020

M.A. No.447/2020

O.A. No.357/2020

M.A. No.446/2020

Thursday, this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of February 2020

**Hon'ble Sri Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**  
**Hon'ble Sri A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

O.A. No.349/2020

Shri Tikam Singh, age 63 years  
s/o late Shri Ghasita,  
Designation Retd. TGT, Group C  
r/o H.No.2119, Janta Flat  
GTB Enclave, Delhi – 110 0093

O.A. No.350/2020

Shri Reoti Prasad s/o late Shri Mewa Ram  
Age 62 years,  
Designation Retd. TGT, Group B  
r/o D-4/7, Gali No.4  
Sadatpur Extension  
Delhi – 110 094

O.A. No.352/2020

Ratan Singh, age 60 years  
s/o late Shri Shyam Lal  
Designation Retd. TGT, Group B



r/o B – 46, Gali No.1  
Rajeev Nagar, Mandoli, Delhi – 110 093

O.A. No.356/2020

Shri Mohar Singh, age 60 years  
Group C  
Designation Retd. TGT  
s/o late Shri Rewati Singh  
r/o H.No.406, Gali No.8  
Shakti Vihar, East Dayalpur  
Delhi – 110 094

O.A. No.357/2020

Shri Roop Singh, aged 60 years  
s/o late Shri Fatan Singh  
TGT (Retd.), Group B  
r/o B-24-A, Gali No.11  
Jagat Puri Extension  
New Delhi – 110 093

..Applicants

(Sri Peeush Kulshreshtha, Advocate)

Versus

1. The Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Through the Chief Secretary  
New Secretariat, New Delhi
2. Director of Education  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Directorate of Education  
Old Secretariat, Delhi – 110 054
3. Dy. Director of Education  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
(North East District)  
RPV Vidyalaya  
B Block, Yamuna Vihar,  
Delhi – 110 053

...Respondents

(Ms. Esha Majumdar, Advocate)

## O R D E R (O R A L)

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**



The applicants in these O.As. responded to a notification issued by the Delhi Administration for appointment to the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT), in various categories, in the year 1983. However, their appointment took place in the year 1989, as a result of directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1900/1987. They have also retired from service between 2013 – 2016. They filed these O.As. with prayer to direct the respondents to notionally fix their pay for the post from 1983 onwards, and their seniority accordingly, together with all the consequential benefits. Prayer is also made for extension of pay scale of Rs.6500-10500, on completion of 12 years of service reckoned from 1983.

2. The applicants contend that once they have been included in the panel in the year 1983, the appointment ought to have been with reference to that year. They submit that notwithstanding the delay in issuing orders of appointment, the respondents ought to have reckoned their seniority from 1983 and fixed the pay scale also.



3. We heard Sri Peeush Kulshreshtha, learned counsel for applicants and Ms. Esha Majumdar, learned counsel for respondents, at the stage of admission.

4. It is not in dispute that the applicants were appointed in the year 1989 as TGT. The first paragraph of the order reads:

"On the recommendations of the Staff Selection Board and the approval of the competent authority and also in terms of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1900 of 1987 in the case of Union of India & ors. Vs Ishwar Singh Khatri & Ors., the following candidates selected for appointment to the Post of TGT (Hindi)/TGT (Sanskrit) Male/Female in the Pay Scale of Rs.1400-2,600 plus usual allowances as admissible under the rules from time to time are hereby nominated for appointment on purely temporary subject to the usual terms and conditions to the districts mentioned against each."

5. The applicants are not able to point out that the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed that the appointment shall be with effect from the date of inclusion in the panel. Further, assuming that there was such direction and the respondents did not extend the benefit, the applicants were expected to take necessary steps at the relevant point of time. They remained silent for the entire length of



service and it is only 5 years after their retirement, that these O.As. have been filed.

6. We do not find any basis to grant the relief in these O.As. They are accordingly dismissed.

7. All the M.As. shall stand disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

**( A. K. Bishnoi )**  
**Member (A)**

**( Justice L. Narasimha Reddy )**  
**Chairman**

**February 6, 2020**

/sunil/