

2  
11  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

C.P. No. 383 of 2000  
in  
O.A. No. 2621 of 1999

New Delhi, dated this the 14<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2001

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

Shri Yamuna  
S/o Shri Hari Shankar,  
R/o 2114/2, Yamuna Bazar,  
Near Neeli Chhauturi Mandir,  
Delhi-110006. . . Petitioner

(By Advocate: Shri A.P. Mohanty)

Versus

1. Respondent No. 1 deleted.
2. Shri R.P. Vasishtha,  
Under Secretary,  
Dept. of Chemical & Petro Chemical,  
Shastri Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110001. . . Respondent No. 2

(By Advocate: Shri Madhav Panikar)

ORDER

S.R. ADIGE, VC (A)

Heard both sides on C.P. No. 383/2000.

2. By the Tribunal's order dated 10.1.2000 in O.A. No. 2621/99 it was directed that applicant's services would not be terminated by appointing another candidate on ad hoc basis but this would not prevent respondents from appointing regularly selected candidates.

3. Applicant's services were not replaced by any ad hoc candidate, but upon the posting <sup>16</sup> of three regularly selected candidates, vide order dated

(12)

10.5.2000, and upon two of them reporting for duty on 11.5.2000, applicant and one more ad hoc LDC who were the junior most ad hoc LDCs with respondents as on 11.5.2000 (an assertion made by respondents in their reply to the C.P. which has not been denied by applicant in any rejoinder), were required to be terminated, as ad hoc appointees had to make way for regularly selected candidates.

4. Further, it is also not denied by applicant in any rejoinder to respondents' assertion contained in the reply to the C.P., that applicant failed to qualify in the Clerks' Grade Exam., held in 1999 as well as in 2000.

5. In the result no reason to warrant initiation of contempt proceedings are made out against respondents. C.P. is dismissed. Notices discharged.

A. Vedavalli

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)  
Member (J)

karthik

Arulagam

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