

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No.2162 of 1999

New Delhi, this the 5th day of March, 2001

20

HON'BLE MR.KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER(JUDL)

Madan Singh S/o Shri Inder Singh (Kutti Singh)
R/o C/o Mr.Ramesh Kumar
Vill. & PO Mitarau, Nazafgarh
New Delhi

- APPLICANT

(By Advocate: Shri M.K.Gaur)

Versus

Union of India, through

1. The General Manager
Northern Railway, Baroda House,
New Delhi
2. The Divisional Railway Manager
Northern Railway, State Entry Road
New Delhi
3. The Inspector of Works
Northern Railway, Kashmiri Gate
New Delhi

-RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: None)

O R D E R(ORAL)

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

Applicant in this O.A. has prayed for the following reliefs:

- "(a) directing the respondents to consider the case of the applicant for re-engagement in accordance with the seniority mentioned in the Casual Labour Live Register, in the light of CPOs' Conference held in September 1998 and vide respondents letter No.CRMS/G/20 dated 14.10.98; and
- (b) to allow the present O.A. with all other consequential benefits."

2. Applicant claims to have worked under respondents w.e.f. 24.7.77 to 2.9.77 and again from 5.9.77 to 1982. He was disengaged in the year 1982 on account of completion of work. It is submitted that in CPOs' Conference held in the year 1998, it was decided




21

that names of all the casual labourers who were working under Railways, should have been placed on the Live Casual Labour Register (in short 'LCLR'). However, there is nothing on record to show that applicant's name was ever placed on the LCLR.

3. I have heard Shri M.K.Gaur, learned counsel for the applicant. None appeared on behalf of respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant prayed that at least, respondents can be directed to decide the representation of the applicant which is pending with them. However after going through the O.A., I find that applicant has not been able to make out a case for grant of reliefs claimed by him. Admittedly, the applicant had worked as far back in 1977 and 1982 and after his disengagement, he had not made any representation for placing his name on LCLR. Applicant has not been able to show that his name exists on the LCLR. He has failed to explain what he had been doing after his disengagement in the year 1982 till the date he filed the present O.A. before the Tribunal.

5. Under the circumstances, this O.A. being highly belated, is dismissed on the grounds of delay and laches. No costs.


(KULDIP SINGH)
MEMBER(JUDL)

/dinesh/