

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.3218/2001

New Delhi this the 3rd day of December, 2001.

HON'BLE MR. V.K. MAJOTRA, MEMBER (ADMNV)

Smt. Munni Devi,  
R/o E-237, Amar Colony,  
Lajpat Nagar,  
New Delhi.

-Applicant

(By Advocate Ms. Harvinder Oberoi)

-Versus-

1. GNCT Delhi through  
Secretary, Department of Education,  
Delhi Secretariat, ITO, New Delhi.
2. Director of Education,  
GNCT, Old Secretariat,  
New Delhi.
3. Deputy Director of Education,  
Distt. East,  
Rani Garden,  
Geeta Colony, Delhi.
4. Deputy Director of Education,  
Distt. South West,  
C-4 Vasant Vihar,  
New Delhi.
5. Principal,  
GG SSS No.1,  
Sarojini Nagar,  
New Delhi-110023.

-Respondents

(By Advocate -None)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant. This application has been made against the inaction of the respondents for regularising the applicant in the post of Waterwoman with effect from the date her junior was regularised. The learned counsel stated that the applicant joined respondent No.5 on 7.4.1988 on the post of part time Waterwoman and has continued to function as such till date. In the seniority list of part time workers, such as water man/waterwoman/mali (Annexure P-8) dated 7.6.1994 the applicant's name is mentioned at serial No.52. Annexure

/h

3

P-9 dated 1.9.98 is the list of eligible P/T Waterwoman recommended for regularisation against the vacant posts of Waterman. The applicant No.1 is at serial No.23 therein. It was also indicated in Annexure P-9 that on regularisation she was to join in District East. She was also made an offer of appointment on temporary post of Waterwoman vide Annexure P-11 on 20.10.98 and though she was relieved on 7.9.98 (Annexure P-10) to join in pursuance of the offer of appointment she was not allowed to join and reverted to respondent No.5. She made a representation on 5.3.2001 followed by a legal notice to the respondents and although vide Annexure P-14 dated 22.3.2001 respondents informed her that her case has been sent to the competent authority J.D.E. (Admn.) for consideration and subsequent reminders have also been sent, it has not yet been decided. The learned counsel stated that the applicant is aggrieved that her juniors Shanta Devi and Bimla whose names are at serial Nos. 24 and 29 respectively in the list of eligible P/T Watermen <sup>but</sup> have been recommended for regularisation (Annexure P-9) <sup>her</sup> case has not yet been decided.

2. Having regard to the claims made on the basis of the enclosed documents, in my view, ends of justice would be duly met, if at this stage, even without issuing a notice to the respondents, they are called upon to decide applicant's representation dated 5.3.2001 by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of two months from the date of communication of these orders. Applicant's legal notice as well as this OA also to be

4

(3)

treated as a part of applicant's representation by the respondents. This OA is disposed of in the above terms.  
No costs.

V.K. Majotra  
3.12.2001  
(V.K. Majotra)  
Member (A)

'San.'