

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

OA 2016/199

New Delhi this the 26th day of July, 2000

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

1. Ahmed Parvez  
S/O Mohd Ali,  
R/O 192, Harijan Basti,  
NDMC Quarters, Pachkuian Road,  
Mandir Marg, New Delhi.
2. Santosh Kumar  
S/O Sh. Hakim Thakur,  
R/O D-8, National Zoological Park  
Staff quarters, New Delhi.
3. Rajesh Chand  
S/O Shankar Lal  
R/O E-338, Sewa Nagar,  
New Delhi.
4. Shiv Kumar  
S/O Mata Prasad,  
R/OF-1922, Netaji Nagar,  
New Delhi-23
5. Brahma Pal  
S/O Babu Singh  
C/O Ahmed Parvez, 192 Harijan  
Basti, NDMC Quarters, Pachkuian Road,  
New Delhi.

.. Applicants

(By Advocate Shri A.K. Jairath )

Versus

1. The Union of India,  
through  
Secretary, Ministry of Environment  
and Forests, Govt. of India,  
Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-3
2. The Director,  
National Zoological Park,  
New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri V.S.R. Krishna )

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

This application has been filed by five applicants,  
who are aggrieved by a verbal termination order dated 1.9.99.

They state that they have been working with the respondents

for doing various kinds of jobs as mentioned in Para 4.3 of the OA. They have stated that they have been working with the respondents for various periods from Oct., 1997 till they were discharged by the aforesaid order dated 1.9.1999. According to them, the respondents constantly need additional ~~staff~~<sup>casual</sup> labourers to do the work which they were doing earlier. They have accordingly prayed that the respondents may be directed to reengage them and absorb them with retrospective effect as temporary staff of the Zoo against the existing group 'D' posts.

2. I have seen the reply filed by the respondents and heard Sh.V.S.R. Krishna, learned counsel. The respondents have submitted that the DOP&T OM dated 10.9.1993 would not be applicable to the facts of the present case as the applicants were not in service at the relevant time, apart from the fact that none of them had put in 240 days of continuous service for grant of Temporary status or any other benefits provided under the Scheme. However, learned counsel has submitted that <sup>as and</sup> when they ~~had~~ required the services of <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ casual labourers, they had written to <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ applicants, who unfortunately did not join within the time directed. To this, learned counsel for the applicants has submitted that the applicants may <sup>be given</sup> slightly longer notice to enable them to join the duties as they are unemployed and most willing to render

14

the services of casual labourers as and when required by the respondents.

3. Noting the above facts, the OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents, <sup>that</sup> in case, they have work which the applicants were doing earlier and in case the applicants apply for the same, they may be considered for reengagement in preference to outsiders and juniors.

No order as to costs.

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