

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.No.2100/99

9

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)

New Delhi, this the 5th day of July, 2000

Smt. Malti Devi  
W/o Shri Maheshwar  
r/o House No.156  
Gali No.8  
Nangloi, Prem Nagar  
New Delhi.

... Applicant

(By Shri Surinder Singh, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Union of India through  
General Manager  
Northern Railway  
Baroda House  
New Delhi - 1.

2. The Divisional Railway Manager  
Northern Railway  
State Entry Road  
New Delhi - 110 001.

3. The DPO (Spl.)  
DRM's Office  
New Delhi. ... Respondents

(By Mrs. Meera Chhibber, Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

The OA is hopelessly misconceived. The applicant is a temporary Khalasi in DRM office. Her grievance is that she was experiencing difficulties on account of her frequent transfers and harassment by the staff in the Department and that she was not allowed to mark attendance in the transferred place, being a lady worker she is not being properly treated.

2. In the counter affidavit the case of the respondents is that she was not only misbehaving herself but was also refusing to do work. As the allegations of harassment are false. Though she has been transferred to stores in 1995 and thereafter to

✓✓✓

10

Mechanical Branch in 1997, at no place she has been attending to her duties and on this ground nobody was willing to take her.

3. I do not appreciate filing this OA seeking to interfere with the day to day administration in the office. Being a Khalasi she is expected to work wherever she is posted. In the face of clear allegations of disobedience and refusal to do work, I am not prepared to interfere in this matter. It is one of her grievances that she was not allowed to meet the DRM. It must be for a good reason. It is now stated by the learned counsel for the respondents that she was given permission to meet the officer. The allegation that she has not been paid the salary was also denied by the respondents.

4. The allegations made in the OA appears to be baseless. This type of litigation is not in the interest of the applicant herself. The OA is therefore dismissed. No costs.

*Unopposed.*  
(V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY)

VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/RAO/