

(12)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.2168/97 with

M.A.2114/97

New Delhi: this the 27th day of July, 1998.

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

1. Shri Chattar Singh, s/o Sh. Sant Lal.
2. Shri Roshan Lal, s/o Sh. Laxmi Dass,
3. Shri Jiya Lal, s/o Shri Sagar Dass,
4. Shri Daulat Ram, s/o Shri Karam Dass,
5. Sh. Jawahar Lal, s/o Shri Findu Ram,
6. Shri Sagar Dil, s/o Sh. Joban Dass,
7. Shri Supan Das, s/o Pugalu Ram,
8. Shri Dharam Singh, s/o Shri Chain Ram,
9. Sh. Radhey Singh, s/o Shri Dayal Singh,  
R/o RZ 653/8, Gali No.18, Sadh Nagar II,  
Palam Colony, Delhi

(All applicants except Applicant No.9 are staying  
at E-127, Mohamedpur, New Delhi and are working  
as Casual Labourer (Temporary Status) presently  
posted at New Delhi under Regional Director (N R)

..... Applicants.

(By Advocate: Shri T. D. Yadav)

VERSUS

Union of India through  
Secretary,  
Dept. of Atomic Energy,  
Atomic Minerals Division,  
Room No.145-A, South Block,  
New Delhi

2. Regional Director (Northern Region),  
Dept. of Atomic Energy,  
Atomic Minerals Division,  
West Block-7,  
New Delhi - 66.

3. Chief Administrative & Accounts Officer,  
Dept. of Atomic Energy,  
Atomic Minerals Division,  
1-10-153-156, Begumpet,  
Hyderabad - 500016

..... Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri Madhav Panikar)

ORDER(O RAL)

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

Applicants seek regularisation from the date

(3)

their juniors were regularised by extending the benefits of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated 21.4.95 in SLP (C) No. 15619/94 Arvind Kumar Vs. UOI & others (Annexure-A).

2. I have heard Shri T. D. Yadav for the applicants and Shri Madhav Panikar for the respondents.

3. Shri Panikar does not deny that the case of the applicants is fully covered by the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 21.4.95 but ~~but~~ submit that a petition has separately been filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court seeking certain clarifications on the aforesaid judgment and hence till the disposal of the petition, it is not possible to extend the benefits of the aforesaid judgment to the applicants.

4. The fact that a petition seeking clarifications of the aforesaid judgment dated 21.4.95 is awaiting disposal by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, should not deter the respondents from extending the benefits of the aforesaid judgment to the applicants when as per respondents' own submission their case is fully covered by the aforesaid judgment.

5. Under the circumstance this OA is disposed of with direction to the respondents to extend the benefits of the aforesaid judgment dated 21.4.95 to the applicants as expeditiously as possible and in no case beyond 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

6. These directions will be subject to the outcome

(14)

of clarification petition awaiting disposal before  
the Hon'ble Supreme Court as referred to above.

*Arfodige*  
( S. R. ADIGE )  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

/ug/