

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.698/2001

New Delhi, this the 30th day of the March, 2001

HON'BLE MR. S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (A)

Shri. Dhanajay Joshi
S/o Shri C.M. Joshi
R/o C-2/94, Yamuna Vihar,
Delhi-110053.

... Applicant

(Applicant in person)

V E R S U S

1. The Director of Education
Old Secretariat,
Delhi-110054.
2. State N.C.T. of Delhi
Through Secretary Education
Delhi Admn. Old Secretariat
Delhi-110054.
3. Hon'ble Lt. Governor,
NCT of Delhi
Raj Nivas, Delhi-110054.
4. D.D.E. (Dist. North-West-B)
F-U Block, Pitam Pura, Delhi.
5. The D.D.O./ Principal,
Govt. Boys Sr. Sec. School,
U-Block, Mangol Puri, Delhi.

... Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

By Mr. S.A.T. Rizvi, Hon'ble Member (A) :

Heard the applicant in person.

2. He was first appointed as a TGT (SST) under the Directorate of Education, Govt. of NCT Delhi vide office memorandum dated 30.6.1998. He continued to work thereafter through extensions granted to him in piecemeal. According to him, he was still working in the month of June, 2000 whereafter his services have been dispensed with.

2

2

(2)

3. His grivance is two-fold. Firstly, his services have been terminated or dispensed with without any justification and secondly, the salary due to him for the monthy of June, 2000 has also not been paid. From the documents placed on record by the applicant it appears that a cheque for Rs.7,407/- was prepared and issued to cover the salary of the applicant for June, 2000. However, the payment of the same was stopped by the respondents without assigning any reason.

4. I have heard the applicant carefully and find that he has not placed on record any document to show that he was still working in the month of June, 2000. Similarly, he has also not placed on record any document by virtue of which he could claim further retention in service beyond June, 2000. The only letter of appointment placed on record is the one dated 30.6.1998 which goes to show that he was engaged in a temporary capacity for a fixed term. It is likely that he was retained in service on the basis of similar letters issued by the respondents from time to time. There is nothing to show that the applicant was regularly appointed at any point of time.

5. For the reasons mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, the present OA cannot be entertained and deserves to be dismissed in limini on the ground that no grievance as such has been disclosed duly supported by documentary evidence. The same is

2

3

(3)

dismissed. He^{is} given liberty, however, to approach the Tribunal or any other appropriate forum in due course if so advised after collecting some more relevant information not enclosed with the present OA. No costs.

P. A. T. Rizvi

(S.A.T.RIZVI)
MEMBER(A)

/ravi/