

(15)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench
.....

R.A. No. 208/95

in

O.A. No. 1955/94

New Delhi, this the 22 day of August, 1995.

Hon'ble Shri J.P.Sharma, Member (J)
Hon'ble Shri B.K.Singh, Member (A)

Union of India through:

1. Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Ministry of Water Resources,
Shram Shakti Bhawan,
New Delhi-1.
2. Chairman,
Central Water Commission,
Sewa Bhawan, R.K.Puram,
New Delhi-66.
3. Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances
& Pensions, (Deptt. of Personnel & Trg.),
North Block, New Delhi-1.
4. Controlling & Auditor General,
Govt. of India,
Bahadurshah Zafar Marg,
New Delhi.
5. Sh. Shri Chand,
Dy. Director, Mont. Directorate (S.E.)
Central Water Commission,
Room No. 402, Sewa Bhawan, RK.Puram,
New Delhi-66.

..Review applica
nts.

Versus

Shri Pramod Kumar,
s/o Shri Bhim Singh,
R/o B-1, WZ-41, Janakpuri,
New Delhi.

..Opposite party

ORDER

(By Hon'ble Shri J.P.Sharma, Member (J))

U.O.I. has filed this review application and has

↓

16

sought review of the order dated 20.4.1995 passed in O.A. No. 1955/94. Shri Parmod Kumar filed the original application which was disposed of by a direction to the respondents that the applicant may be preferred for engagement on job requirement as expeditiously as possible and he shall be considered alongwith others sponsored by Employment Exchange and may be given engagement as a casual worker till the job requirement lasts. There is no specific error pointed out in the judgement nor any particular point stressed. Certain facts have been reiterated in this review application pointing out that the clear stand taken by the respondents has not been considered. However, it is not so. The direction in this judgement is only that the applicant be also considered alongwith the others sponsored by Employment Exchange. Since 1990, as per showing of the respondents, a number of days has been shown till 1994 and he has worked for 240 days in 1994 though in earlier years his working was less. However, after disengaging the applicant, the respondents in June, 1994 have continued the junior employee Sh. Mahesh and another junior employee Sh. Om Parkash was engaged in October, 1994. It is after the dis-engagement of the applicant in March, 1993 and the services of the applicant in Sept. 1994 were dispensed with. Thus, the respondents were engaging casual labourers on ad-hoc basis after discharging the one who had already been working with them. This hire and fire policy was therefore, arbitrary and

17

has also been adversely commented by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of decision. No other thing has been pressed in this R.A. The R.A. is, therefore, totally devoid of merits and the judgement does not call for any review.

(B.K.SINGH)
MEMBER (A)

(J.P.SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)

/nk a/