

8

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No. 2342 of 1995

New Delhi this the 1st day of July, 1996

HON'BLE S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE MRS. Lakshmi swaminathan, MEMBER (J)

- (1) Shri Raj Kumar
S/o Shri Dharampal,
R/o 4664, Gali Paswan,
Balimarah,
Delhi-110 006.

- (2) Shri Dharmender Dutt
S/o Shri Vidya Dutt,
R/o H-41 C, Dilshad Garden,
Delhi-110 095.

...Applicants

By Advocate Shri A.K. Bhardwaj

Versus

1. Union of India through
The Secretary,
Ministry of Welfare,
Government of India,
A Wing, 6th Floor,
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.
 2. The Joint Secretary,
Ministry of Welfare,
Government of India,
A Wing, 6th Floor,
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 001.
 3. The Sr. Accounts Officer,
National Institute of Rehabilitation,
Training & Research,
Ministry of Welfare,
Government of India,
Olatpur P.O. Bairoi,
District Cuttack (Orissa).
 4. The Director (NI),
Ministry of Welfare,
HW Division,
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.
- A



5. The Director,
National Institute for the Visually
Handicapped,
Ministry of Welfare,
Government of India,
16, Rajpur Road,
Dehradun,
U.P. India.

..Respondents

By Advocate Mrs. P.K. Gupta

ORDER

Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Member (A)

The applicants themselves admit that since 1.1.1994 applicant No.1 was being paid his salary from National Institute of Rehabilitation, Training and Research, Ministry of Welfare, while applicant No.2 was being paid his salary from the National Institute for the Visually Handicapped and both of them were serving as daily wagers in those two institutions when they were disengaged in November, 1995. Respondents in their reply have taken the preliminary objection that the said institutions are Autonomous Bodies registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, and as they have not been covered by Notification under Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, they do not come within the CAT's jurisdiction.

3. In this connection, respondents counsel Mrs. Gupta has shown us a copy of order dated 17.9.1993 in O.A. No. 662 of 1992 - Kanaklata Devi Vs. Director, N.I.R.T.R. and Others decided by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, wherein it has been categorically held that N.I.R.T.R. does not come within the Tribunal's

.3.

7

jurisdiction.

4. Under the circumstances, the respondents preliminary objection is upheld and this O.A. is accordingly dismissed as not maintainable before this Tribunal, leaving it open to the applicants to move the appropriate forum, if so advised. No costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
MEMBER (A)

S.R. Adige
(S.R. ADIGE)
MEMBER (A)

RKS