

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.1682 of 1997

NEW DELHI, THIS THE 29th DAY OF JULY, 1997.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)

Mrs. V.R.Ramani
W/o Sh. K.C.Warrior
Bhutan Investigation Division
Central Water Commission
P.B. No. 5
Phuntsholing
BHUTAN

....Applicant

(BY ADVOCATE MS. MONIKA ROHATGI)

Vs.

1. Union of India
Ministry of Water Resources
Through its Secretary
Sharam Shakti Bhawan
New Delhi.
2. Union of India
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel and Training
North Block
New Delhi.
3. The Chairman
Central Water Commission
Sewa Bhawan
R.K.Puram
New Delhi.
4. The Executive Engineer
Bhutan Investigation Division
Central Water Commission
Phuntsholing
Bhutan.

....Respondents

ORDER

JUSTICE K.M. AGARWAL:

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant on admission. The main relief claimed in this application

Jan

is for regularisation of the service of the applicant. She had earlier filed OA No.2613/93 which was decided by this Tribunal on 18.12.1996. Pursuant to the order made by the Tribunal, it appears that the applicant filed her representation on 3.1.1997 which was rejected by the impugned order dated 31.3.1997.

2. As the impugned order would show, the applicant was not appointed through the employment exchange, but purely on ad hoc basis as Workcharged Work-Assistant under Royal Government of Bhutan Service Rules applicable to workcharged employees in Bhutan with the condition that the appointment would not confer any right to claim for any seniority or regular appointment. It appears that from time to time, she was given extension of service and ultimately removed from service. She was not allowed to work for 110 days but thereafter she was given again a fresh appointment with effect from 17.6.1991 as Work Assistant on workcharged purely on ad hoc basis against the terms and conditions, scale of the Royal Government of Bhutan as applicable from time to time.

3. In OA Nos.512/92, 750/92, 1230/92 and 1590/96, decided on 12.3.1997, similar employees had claimed their absorption. The applications were dismissed. On the similar reasoning, this application for regularisation also deserves to be dismissed.

4. It may also be made clear that no part of cause of action arose in India. The application itself will show that the applicant was given appointment and.


Jim

she is in service in Bhutan. Her residence is in Bhutan and the cause title also gives her address of Bhutan. For this reason, it appears that we have no jurisdiction even to entertain the application.

5. The learned counsel cited **STATE OF HARYANA vs. PIARA SINGH, (1992) 4 SCC 118** to submit that the applicant was entitled for regularisation. However, the reliance was mis-placed and needs no consideration.

6. For the foregoing reasons, we find no merit in this application. It is accordingly hereby dismissed summarily.


(K.M. Agarwal)
Chairman


(N. Sahu)
Member (A)

sns