

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Principal Bench

13

O.A. No. 2216 of 1999

New Delhi, dated this the 28th July, 2000

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE MR. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

Smt. Sushma Kumar, I,
W/o Shri Jagdish Kumar,
R/o 550, Village Bijwasan,
New Delhi-110061.

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Sama Singh)

Versus

1. The Lt. Governor of Delhi,
Raj Niwas Marg,
Delhi.
2. The Govt. of NCT of Delhi through
the Chief Secretary,
Old Secretariat,
Sham Nath Marg,
Delhi-110054.
3. The Director of Education,
Government of NCT of Delhi,
Old Secretariat,
Delhi-110054.

Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Vijay Pandita)

ORDER (Oral)

MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

Applicant impugns the respondents' orders dated 23.8.99 (Annexure A-1) and order dated 29.9.99 (Annexure A-2). She seeks a direction to respondents to consider permanently absorbing her as Assistant Teacher in the Directorate of Education, Govt. of NCT, Delhi.

2. We have heard Shri Sama Singh, counsel for applicant and Shri Vijay Pandita, counsel for respondents.
3. Applicant in her O.A. herself admits that she

7

was appointed as an Assistant Teacher under the Government of Rajasthan on 8.2.74 and was regularised on 2.7.74.

4. In an identical case bearing O.A. No. 2180/99 filed by Smt. Krishna Kataria, that applicant who was also an Assistant Teacher appointed by the Government of Rajasthan had prayed for regular absorption in the Government of NCT of Delhi, that prayer was rejected by the C.A.T. P.B. by order dated 30.3.2000 (Annexure R-2) against which Smt. Kataria filed CWP No. 2230/2000 in the Delhi High Court which was disposed of by order dated 8.5.2000 where in it was held that as Smt. Krishna Kataria was an employee of Government of Rajasthan she could not seek permanent in NCT of Delhi as a matter of right. That CWP was dismissed in limine.

5. In the present case, Shri Sama Singh has informed us that applicant has preferred a representation for permanent absorption to the L.G., Delhi and also to the Dept. of Personnel & Training, Government of India but no final orders have been received by applicant on the same as yet.

6. In the light of what has been stated above, we find no good grounds to interfere in the O.A. at this stage.

7. It will be open to respondents to pass an appropriate orders on the representation said to have been filed by the applicant, and referred to in Paragraph 5 above.

8. The O.A. is, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

9. In this connection, we have no doubt that respondents will give reasonable time to applicant to wind up her ~~teach~~^{stay} in Delhi before they relieve her to enable her to join duties in Rajasthan.

Kuldeep
(KULDIP SINGH)
Member (J)

Abdul
(S. B. ADIL)
Vice Chairman (A)

/GK/