

(14)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

OA 1579/98

New Delhi this the 28th day of January, 2000

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

Amit Kumar
S/O Sh. Prem Swaroop
R/O A-238, Azadpur,
Subzi Mandi, Delhi.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate Mrs Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Department of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom Project, Sanchar Bhawan,
Delhi.
3. Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Project
Chandra Marg,
Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Rajeev Bansal)

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

The applicant has filed this OA on 13.8.98 in which he has, inter alia, challenged his termination order with effect from April, 1998. Thereafter it is noticed from the reply filed by the respondents on 25.11.99 that the applicant has been taken back in service and is continuing on daily wages even till date. This fact has also been confirmed by the learned counsel for the applicant.

2. Shri Rajeev Bansal, learned counsel for the respondents has drawn my attention to the respondents Office Order dated 3.3.98 . By this order, the applicant was ¹⁸one of the two candidates who were called upon to submit certain documents with regard to the action taken by the respondents earlier to cancel the order granting them temporary status on 20.1.98. He has also

8

15
submitted that the order itself recorded that the applicant has refused to sign the same and has also not produced the relevant documents ~~as~~ called for. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted at the Bar that the applicant will submit the necessary documents as called for by Office Order dated 3.3.98 within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, she has submitted that with regard to the list of number of days the applicant has worked on daily wages on contract basis, the details will be verified by the respondents from their own records.

3. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant's claim to quash the termination order and to direct the respondents to reinstate ~~him~~ in service does not arise. Learned counsel for applicant does not press the back wages for the period he was out of job.

4. In the result, OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the applicant, taking into account the number of days ~~he~~ has put in ~~as~~ daily wager in terms of the relevant scheme framed by them from 1.10.89 as amended from time to time. Necessary action in this regard shall be taken within two months from the date of receipt of the documents from the applicant as mentioned above. No order as to costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)

Member (J)