

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 976 of 2000
M.A. No. 1496 of 2000

1999

12

New Delhi, in the 20th day of the October, 2000

Hon'ble Mr. M.P. Singh, Member(A)

1. Shri Amar Singh,
S/o Shri Genda Lal,
Village: Narhauri, Post Office: Aduki,
District: Mathura (U.P.)
2. Shri Ram Phal
S/o Shri Amar Singh,
Village: Narhauri, Post Office: Aduki,
District: Mathura (U.P.)
3. Shri Phool Singh
S/o Shri Mangal Singh
Village: Narhauri, Post Office: Aduki,
District: Mathura (U.P.)

..... Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri D.N. Sharma)

Versus

1. Union of India through
The Secretary of the Government of India),
Ministry of Defence, South Block,
New Delhi.
2. The Quarter Master General,
Quarter Master General's Branch (Q1(c),
Army Headquarters, D.H.Q. Post Office,
New Delhi-110011.
3. The Director General Supply & Transport(ST-12)
Quarter Master General's Branch,
Army Headquarter,
New Delhi-110011.
4. The Officer Commanding,
338(I) Coy ASC(Supply) Type 'A',
Mathura-281001.

..... Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. Rajinder Nischal)

ORDER (oral)

1. MA 1496/2000 is filed by the applicants who seek direction to respondents to absorb them against the notified vacancies of Civilian Mazdoors at Central



(2)

Ordinance Depot., Agra or at any other unit where such vacancies are presently available in compliance with the orders of this Tribunal passed on 10.12.99. The respondents have filed their reply and have stated that the recruitment is being made by the Commandant Central Ordinance Depot., Agra who does not come under jurisdiction of the respondents. Apart from it, these personnel were employed by erstwhile 3 RPD which came under the Directorate of Supply and Transport (ST-12). According to them the nature of work and its experience with the then 3 RPD cannot be compared with Central Ordinance Depot., Agra.


2. Heard the learned counsel for the applicants and learned counsel for the respondents and perused the records.

3. The plea taken by the respondents that Central Ordinance Depot., Agra does not come under the jurisdiction is not acceptable. In OA 976/1999, the directions were given to the respondents vide order dated 10.12.1999 to the effect that ^{in case 2} they have ^{any} ~~and~~ work for casual labourers, they will also consider, the case of the applicants for re-engagement. It is not clear that as to how the Central Ordinance Depot., Agra does not come under the jurisdiction of the respondents. In any case, the Central Ordinance Depot., Agra is under the Ministry of Defence and hence the plea taken by the respondents is rejected. The other contention of the respondents that the



(3)

nature of work and experience with the then 3 RPD cannot be compared with the nature of work to be done at Central Ordinance Depot., Agra is also not tenable as there can not be any separate classification for performing the duties as casual labour in Group 'D'. Therefore, the other plea is also rejected. The respondents are further directed to comply with the order of the Tribunal dated 10.12.1999 and consider the cases of the applicants for re-engagement at COD Agra or elsewhere in preference to the juniors and outsiders. No costs.


(M.P. Singh)
Member(A)

/ravi/