

3.

(X)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No. 618/95

NEW DELHI THIS THE DAY OF 6 MARCH, 1997.

**HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR.N.SAHU, MEMBER(A)**

1. Umed Singh  
No.8378518/41/BN  
11969, DAP  
Resident of Police Lines  
Model Town  
New Delhi-110019.
2. Attar Singh  
No.831310686/43 BN  
11967 DAP  
Model Town  
New Delhi-110019.
3. Nissan Ahmed  
No.841120337/96 Bn.  
4174, DAP,  
Model Town Police Lines  
New Delhi-110019.
4. Inder Mani No.831110535  
76 Bn/937/Sec.  
Security Line, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
5. M.Aslam  
830765334/96 Bn  
712/Sec.  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
6. Karsan, No.830726204/25 Bn.  
1091/SC  
Resident of Security Lines  
Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
7. Dinesh Singh  
830754332/Dte.  
785/Sec.  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
8. Dheer Singh  
No.830750068/DTE/930/Sec.  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
9. Sudarshan Kumar  
810693703/DTE/987/Sec.  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.
10. Naresh Kumar  
841322286/47 Bn/11967 DAP  
Resident of Police Lines  
Model Town  
Delhi-110009.

11. Raj Pal Singh  
830754421/Dte/923/Sec  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.

12. Shankar Lal  
821131415/DTE/760/Sec.  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg,  
New Delhi.

(BY ADVOCATE SHRI A.KALIA)

....APPLICANTS

Vs.

Union of India through

1. The Commissioner of Police  
MSO Building  
JP Estate, New Delhi-110002.

2. The Dy.Commissioner of Police,  
Security Lines, Vinay Marg  
New Delhi.

3. The Dy.Commissioner of Police  
Vth Bn. Model Town  
Delhi-110009.

(BY ADVOCATE SHRI GIRISH KATHPALIA)

....RESPONDENTS

**ORDER**

**MR.JUSTICE K.M.AGARWAL:**

This is an application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act,1985 for quashing the impugned order of repatriation(Annexure A1) and for futher direction to the respondents to allow the applicants to continue in service with the respondents by extending the period of their deputation.

2. It appears that the applicants were appointed as Constables by the Central Reserve Police Force(C.R.P.F) and were working as such with the C.R.P.F. Subsequently they were taken on deputation in Delhi Police for a period of one year. On expiry of that period of deputation, the <sup>order</sup> impugned of repatriation was passed against the applicants.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, we are of the view that this application has absolutely no force and deserves to be dismissed. A person on deputation cannot claim as a matter of right his absorption in service

*Yours*

with the borrowing department. Earlier, it appears that in the year 1990, there was a decision to absorb a considerable number of Constables who had come on deputation in the Delhi Police and accordingly by Memorandum dated 11.7.1990(Annexure A4), a direction was made for assessment of the suitability of all the Constables of CPO who had completed two years of deputation period, below 40 years of age and Matric or above in education. The applicants cannot claim advantage of that Memorandum of the year 1990, because they came on deputation subsequently when there was no decision to absorb Constables in the manner and to the extent it was decided in the year 1990.

4. For the foregoing reasons, this application is hereby dismissed but without any order as to costs.

*KM*  
(K.M. Agarwal)  
Chairman

*N.Sahu*  
(N. Sahu)  
Member(A)

**sns**