

(11)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.2241/2001
MA No.359/2002

New Delhi this the 3rd day of June, 2002.

HON'BLE MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Surjit Kumar, So SH. Ichha Ram,
R/o House No.1, Nursery Lane,
Opp. 10-Block, Jorebagh,
New Delhi.

-Applicant

(By Advocate Shri S.K. Gupta)

-Versus-

1. Union of India,
through Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel & Public
Grievances & Public Reforms,
North Block, New Delhi.

2. Under Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances
and Pensions, Department of Personnel and
Training, North Block,
New Delhi.

-Respondents

(By Advocate Shri M.K. Bhardwaj, proxy for Sh. A.K.
Bhardwaj)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Mr. Shanker Raju, Member (J):

Heard the parties. Applicant disputes respondents' action where they have treated him to have worked only for 204 days, whereas he is entitled for being accorded of temporary status after rendering 206 days, in accordance with the Scheme of DOP&T of 1993. Learned counsel has referred to the decision of the Apex Court in Union of India v. Mohan Pal, 2000 (4) SCALE 216, wherein it has been held that those casual labours who are not in service on the date of inception of the Scheme, i.e., 19.9.1993, are not entitled for being accorded temporary status, as the Scheme is not an on going Scheme. In this view of the matter, without dealing with the merits of the case as to whether applicant has completed 204 or 206 days, as the case is on all fours covered by the decision of the Apex Court (supra) the O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)