

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. Surinder 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.

*CAA*

19

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

Car

15

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.

*Shanta Shastry*  
(Mrs. Shanta Shastry)

Member(A)

*V. Rajagopala Reddy*  
(V. Rajagopala Reddy)  
Vice Chairman(J)

dbc