

-9-

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

O.A. 1913/99

New Delhi this the 18th day of July, 2000

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

1. Shri R.K. Kashyap,  
S/o Shri Satyapal,  
R/o House No. B-39,  
Malikpur, Near Model Town,  
New Delhi-110009.
2. Shri S.K. Sharma,  
S/o Shri O.P. Sharma,  
R/o H.No. H-23/23-D,  
Jai Prakash Nagar,  
Gonda, Shahdara,  
Delhi-110053.
3. Shri Gopal,  
S/o Shri Ram Prasad,  
R/o H.No.102, PKT-D-6,  
LIG Flats, Sector 6,  
Rohini-110085.

... Applicants.

(None present)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi,  
through its Chief Secretary,  
5, Shyam Nath Marg,  
Delhi-100054.
2. The Chief Electoral Officer,  
Old St. Stephens College Building,  
Kashmere Gate,  
Delhi-110006.

... Respondents.

(By Advocate Shri Rajinder Pandita)

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

This case was listed at Serial No. 8 under the heading that the matters will be taken up serially and no adjournment will be granted. As none has appeared for the applicants even on the second call, I have carefully perused the pleadings and heard Shri Rajinder Pandita, learned counsel for the respondents.

Y.S.

2. The respondents have filed their reply on 3.1.2000 and in spite of several opportunities having been granted to the applicants, no rejoinder has been filed. In paragraph 7 of the O.A., the applicants have categorically declared that they have not previously filed any application, writ petition or suit regarding the matter in issue in the present O.A. Shri Rajinder Pandita, learned counsel has, however, drawn my attention to the reply filed by the respondents with regard to these averments, in which they have stated that the contentions of the applicants are wrong in view of the fact that they had filed two applications (O.As 808/98 and 1083/98) which have been decided by the Tribunal by order dated 8.1.1999. It is also relevant to note that after the respondents have filed their reply on 3.1.2000, none has been appearing for the applicants on last several dates when the case has been listed. The learned proxy counsel on behalf of the applicants had also sought time to file rejoinder, but this has not been done. None has appeared for the applicants on 19.4.2000, 10.5.2000 and again today.

3. In view of the statements made by the applicants in paragraph 7, which are totally incorrect as per the reply filed by the respondents, this application is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone. Normally, the case would have been dismissed with heavy costs on the applicants, but considering the fact that the applicants are part-time casual labourers, the O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member(J)

'SRD'