

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.713/2001

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

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

Shri Jasbir Singh
S/o Shri Raghbir Singh,
R/o Police Quarters, No.A-65,
Police Station Janakpuri,
New Delhi.

... Applicant

(By Advocates: Shri D. Rajshwar Rao)

V E R S U S

1. Government of Delhi
through its Chief Secretary,
National Capital Territory of Delhi,
Old. Sectt. Delhi.
2. Netaji Subash Institute of Technology,
through its Director,
Azad Hind Fauj Marg,
Sector.3 Dawarka,
New Delhi-110045.

... Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

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

Heard the learned counsel.


2. The applicant claims to have been appointed to the post of Supervisor in the Respondent No.2's set up on 14.8.1997 and continued to work as such without break till 14.10.1997. During this period he was paid wages at the rate of Rs.65/- per day. After a break in service the applicant was re-engaged on a similar basis w.e.f. 1.9.1999 and again continued to work till his services were dispensed with on 31.7.2000. Aggrieved by the termination of his service, the applicant has filed the present OA on the ground that the respondents

2

have not complied with the mandatory provisions of law and have acted against the principles of natural justice in terminating his service.

3. In support of his claim, the applicant has placed on record certain challans which goes to show that the applicant used to receive consignments of Mitti on behalf of some one named as Subash Chander and later on behalf of some one name as Pradeep Kumar. There is a statement also placed on record which goes to show that over time payment was made to the applicant for June, 2000. Against the termination of service, the applicant has filed a representation before the respondents on 21.10.2000 a copy of which has been placed on record at annexure A-1. He has not received a reply thereto so far.

4. After hearing the learned counsel, I find that in the present case the applicant has approached the Tribunal within less than six months after filing his representation before the respondents. The OA is thus premature and deserves to be dismissed on this ground alone. The same is accordingly dismissed with liberty to the applicant to approach the Tribunal again in due course in accordance with law and if so advised. No costs.


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

/ravi/