

Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench

O.A. 1589/1999

New Delhi, this the 13th day of November, 2000

Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. M.P. Singh, Member (A)

Dr. Monendra Grover,
S/o Shri H. R. Grover
R/o B-2/251, Paschim Vihar
New Delhi-110063

....Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

1. Director General, CSIR
Government of India,
Ministry of H.R.D., Anusandhan Bhawan
Refi Marg, New Delhi 110001
2. Secretary to the Government of India
Ministry of H.R.D., New Delhi

....Respondents

(By Advocates: Ms. K. Iyer and Shri Manoj Chatterjee)

ORDER (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)

This case is appearing on daily board since 3.11.2000 and none has been appearing for the applicant. Today also, none appeared for the applicant even on the second call. Ms. K. Iyer and Shri Manoj Chatterjee appeared for the respondents and have been heard.

1. In the OA, the applicant has challenged Annexure A-1 order dated 31.3.99 whereby his tenure as Scientist Fellow (QHF) had not been renewed beyond 3.4.99 and his service contract came to an end w.e.f. 3.4.99 (A/N). He had submitted a representation dated 1.4.99 requesting the respondents to withdraw their letter dated 31.3.99 and allow him to complete the tenure of three years. The applicant states that respondents have violated the principles of natural justice in not renewing his tenure beyond 3.4.99 and even no show-cause notice was issued to

km

(P)

him. He has also alleged that certain amount due to him has been withheld by respondents.

3. The O.A. is contested by respondents. They have stated in their reply that as per the appointment letter itself, the applicant was engaged on a specific contract basis for a period of three years subject to renewal of contract on year to year basis depending upon the satisfactory work report and CRs. Since his performance during the preceding years 1997-98 was not upto the mark, so his tenure came to an end.

4. Ms. K. Iyer, learned counsel for the respondents has produced before us the CRs of the applicant which show that performance of the applicant during the relevant period was only 'Average' and that is why the department had not approved the extension of his service tenure.

5. Thus we are of the view that non-extension of the term of contract was in accordance with the conditions stipulated in applicant's appointment letter. As for claim regarding payment of certain arrears is concerned, learned counsel for the respondents has drawn our attention to para 5(c) of applicant's rejoinder wherein it is admitted by the applicant that he has received a cheque for Rs. 12,858/- So on that score also, we find that no

km

13

grievance survives.

6. In the result we find no merit in this OA, which is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

m.p.s
(M.P. Singh)
Member (A)

K.S
(Kuldip Singh)
Member (J)

/dinesh/