

7  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

OA 1827/99

New Delhi this the 10th day of February, 2000

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

1. Lalit Kumar S/O Sh. Sohan Lal Paswan,  
R/O Type-II, H.No. 432, Krishi Kunj,  
Inderpuri, New Delhi-12

2. Dinesh Razak  
S/O Shri Ganesh Razak  
R/O E-351, J.J. Colony, Inder Puri,  
New Delhi.

.. Applicants

(None for the applicants )

Versus

1. Union of India  
through Secretary  
Indian Council of Agriculture Research,  
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Director (Administration),  
Directorate of Extension,  
Krishi Vistar Bhawan,  
Pusa, New Delhi-13

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri K.R. Sachdeva )

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))

The applicants have filed this OA alleging that they have been illegally disengaged from service by the respondents and according to them they have engaged freshers and juniors as daily wagers. They have also prayed for grant of temporary status and appointment on regular basis against the available vacancies of Group 'D' posts according to their seniority on the basis of previous service rendered with the respondents. They have also made certain other claims including arrears of wages.

2. The respondents in their reply have controverted the above facts. They have also noted the dates of the applicants when they were engaged and the details are given at pages 2-3 of the reply. Learned counsel also confirms that the arrears of wages have since been paid to the applicants. According to the respondents, the applicants have not put in <sup>18</sup>minimum period of 206 days of

continuous service for grant of temporary status as laid down in the relevant Scheme dated 1.9.93. Therefore, they are not entitled for grant of this status.

3. None has appeared for the applicant even on the second call. It is noticed that none had appeared for the applicant even on the last date i.e. 9.2.2000. When the case was listed on that date, it was clearly mentioned that if today the applicants or their counsel do not appear, the matter will be taken up on the basis of available records.

4. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respondents, none of the claims of the applicants is tenable in terms of the relevant rules and instructions. It is further noticed that the arrears of pay due to them have since been paid to the applicants, <sup>and is</sup> perhaps for this reasons none had appeared for the applicants.

5. In the result for the reasons given above, there is no merit in the OA. The same is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*  
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)