

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

(A9)

New Delhi, dated this the 1st January, 2002

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

O.A.1550/2000

1. Ms. Madhu,  
S/o Shri Hari Singh,  
R/o 54, Sector-11,  
Noida (UP).
2. V.P. Sewalia,  
S/o Shri G.S. Sewalia,  
R/o 49/4, North West Moti Bagh,  
New Delhi-110021. . . Applicants.

(By Advocate Shri G.K. Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Union of India through  
the Secretary,  
Ministry of Urban Development &  
Poverty Alleviation,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
2. The Director General (Works),  
Central Public Works Dept.,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110011. . . Respondents.

(None appeared)

O.A.2754/1999

1. Shri Chaman Lal,  
L-3262, Ram Nagar Extn.,  
Shahdara,  
Delhi.
2. Mr. Kashi Ram,  
27-D, MIG Flats,  
Pocket-A,  
New Delhi.
3. Shri B.L. Joya,  
S/o Shri Binja ram,  
R/o 82A, DDA Flats,  
Gulabi Bagh,  
New Delhi. . . Applicants.

(By Advocate Proxy counsel  
for Dr. M.P. Raju)

Versus

(50)

1. Union of India  
through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
2. Director General of Works,  
Central Public Works Department,  
Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi. ... Respondents.

(By Advocate Shri S.K. Gupta)

ORDER (Oral)

S.R. ADIGE, VC (A)

Heard both sides on both O.As

2. Both O.As are disposed of in terms of CAT Full (Principal) Bench order dated 5.11.2001 in which it has been held that the ad hoc appointees should be reverted on the basis of "last in the point of time to be promoted first to go irrespective of seniority in the feeder grade" i.e. Dept. of Personnel & Training O.Ms. dated 30.4.83 and 30.9.83 would be applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. In the light of the foregoing in O.A. No. 1550/2000, the impugned order dated 3.11.99 as far as the two applicants are concerned is quashed and set aside, and the two applicants should be placed back as ad hoc Executive Engineer (Electrical) as they were prior to the issue of the impugned order dated 3.11.99 as long as any body was promoted as ad hoc EE(E) later in point of time to them, and has been continued as ad hoc EE (E). Applicants would

(51)

also be entitled to such consequential benefits including backwages as are admissible in accordance with rules and instructions and judicial pronouncements on the subject.

4. In so far as O.A. No. 2754/99 is concerned, it is also disposed in terms mutatis mutandis of the directions given in O.A. No. 1550/2000, and contained in the foregoing paragraphs and should be followed by respondents to the extent the same covers the fact and circumstances of O.A. No. 2754/99.

5. Both O.As stand disposed of accordingly.  
No costs.

6. Let a copy of the order be placed in each case record.

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)  
Member (J)

Karthik

(S.R. Adige)  
Vice Chairman (A)

True copy  
Affixed  
P. S. Venkatesh  
CSC  
01/01/2002