

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 1235 of 1995

New Delhi this the 4th day of October, 1999

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJAGOPALA REEDY, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MRS. SHANTA SHASTRY, MEMBER (A)

1. Surrinder Pal Sharma
S/o Laxmi Narain Sharma
R/o AB-151, Amir Puri, Paharganj
New Delhi-110055.
2. Surinder Bahadur Lal
S/o Shri Sham Pati Lal
R/o 11, Press Quarters
New Delhi.
3. Anil Kumar Bahuguna
S/o Shri Jagdish Prasad Bahuguna
R/o G-122, Sarojini Nagar
New Delhi.
4. Parvez Sabir
S/o Shri Laiq Sabir
R/o H.No.1222, Surkh Pashan Street
Churi Walan
Delhi.
5. Vijay Prakash Nigam
S/o Shri N.R. Nigam
R/o B-11, Samrat Society Flat No.102
Vasundra Enclave
Delhi-110096.
6. Hazri Lal
S/o Shri Gori Shahi
R/o D-371, J.J. Colony
Khiyala
New Delhi-110091.
7. Goverdhan Prasad
S/o Shri Thag Ram Khandoori
R/o 105-A, Gali No.5
South Ganesh Nagar
New Delhi-110092
8. Shekhar Saxena
S/o Shri P.N. Saxena
R/o 6-M, C.P.W.D.
Housing Complex
Vasant Vihar
New Delhi-110057. ... Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri J.C. Madan)

-Versus-

1. Union of India,
Through its Secretary
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
Shastri Bhavan
New Delhi-110011.

CAS

2. Director General
Doordarshan
Government of India
Mandi House
New Delhi.
3. The Director
Delhi Doordarshan Kendra
Sansad Marg
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri S.M. Arif)

O R D E R (Oral)

By Reddy, J.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicants
and the respondents.

2. On 14.9.99, at the request of the learned counsel for the applicants, to ascertain from his clients whether the relief claimed in the OA still survives or not, the case was adjourned. On 29.9.99 time was sought by the learned counsel for the respondents to ascertain from the respondents whether the applicants have been regularised or not. Again today, the learned counsel for the respondents requests for further time to ascertain the position. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that on his part, he has not been able to ascertain the position in the matter from his clients as they were not responding to his letters.


3. This is a matter of 1995 and the relief prayed for is regularisation of the applicants in the post of Floor Assistants/Painters. It is the



case of the respondents that many of the applicants might have been regularised.

4. We are of the view that the applicants are not at all interested in pursuing their case as they do not respond to their counsel. The respondents' counsel also remain without any instructions from his clients. We do not, therefore, see any reason why the case should be adjourned from time to time, for long periods.

5. In the circumstances, we dispose of the OA on the ground that it has become infructuous. The OA is accordingly dismissed as infructuous.


(Mrs. Shanta Shastry)
Member(A)


(V. Rajagopla Reddy)
Vice Chairman(J)

dbc