

(B)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

OA 766/1999

New Delhi this the 27th day of July, 2000

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

1. Ishrat Ali son of Sh. Jamshed Ali.
2. Ram Kishan son of Sh. Julley
3. Sohan Lal son of Sh. Laxman
4. Mata Prasad son of Sh. Ram Charan
5. Raja Ram son of Sh. Jasrath
6. Baldeo Prasad son of Sh. Ghasita
7. Shiv Mohan Singh son of
Shri Raja Ram Singh
8. Gulbadan Singh son of Sh. Sabajit
Singh

.. Applicants

(All lastly working as Monthly rated
casual labour with temporary status
in Central Railway, Jhansi Divn
resident of C/O Mohd. Suvhan Khan
Mohd Rasheed Tailor Master, near
Thanewali Masjid, Nazafgarh, N/Delhi)

(None for the applicants)

Versus

1. Union of India through Chairman
Railway Board, Principal Secretary
to Govt. of India, Ministry of
Railway, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager
Central Railway, MUMBAI CST.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

.. Respondents

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

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

Counter reply on behalf of respondents has been
filed as far back as 16-5-2000 and in spite of several
opportunities having been granted to the applicants, no
rejoinder has been filed. It is also noticed that for the
8:

(b)

previous five consecutive dates since 9.5.2000, none has been appearing for the applicants. In the circumstances, it appears that after seeing the averments made by the respondents in their reply, the applicants are satisfied that they have no case on merits and are not interested in pursuing the case. The respondents have stated that the applicants were engaged for a specific work for a specific period and after the expiry of that period, their engagements came to an end. So they have been disengaged in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions. They have also stated in their reply that in the circumstances of the case, the OA may be dismissed at the admission stage. These averments appear to have been accepted by the applicants.

2. In the above facts and circumstances of the case, as there is no merit in this application, the OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

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

sk