

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A. No.207 of 1994

This 11th day of A p r i l, 1994

Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Mr. B.K. Singh, Member (A)

1. S.C. Kalita,
Village Durgapur,
Post Hakama,
District (Assam).
2. H.B. Pai,
Village Kokla Busty,
Post Jaigaon,
District Jalpaiguri (West Bengal)
3. G.B. Chhetri,
Village Toorsa T.E.,
Post Dalsingpara,
District Jalpaiguri (West Bengal) ... Applicants

By Advocate: Shri N. Amresh

VERSUS

1. The Union of India, through
The Secretary,
Ministry of Water Resources,
Shram Shakti Bhavan, Rafi Marg,
New Delhi.
2. The Central Water Commission, through
Chairman,
Sewa Bhavan, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi. ... Respondents

By Advocate: None present.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, VC(J))

The applicants who were employed in the Chukha
Hydel Project, Bhutan, have come up to this Tribunal
with ^{the} grievance that they have not been absorbed by
the Central Water Commission, respondent No.2.

Contd....2/

Sdy

4

2. We have perused the record of this OA and we find that atleast on 31.7.1991 the applicants were informed that their services were no longer required and that they would be relieved from their duties in the afternoon of 31.7.1991.

3. It appears that some employees, other than the applicants, who were similarly situated, had preferred an OA No. 2213/90 which was disposed of by this Tribunal on 24.7.91 giving relief to those who had come to the Tribunal. It is averred that the applicants' claim is fully covered by the said judgment of this Tribunal. It is also averred that on the basis of the said judgment the applicants had made representations to the respondents to give them the benefit of the said judgment.

4. The fact that some employees, other than the applicants, who came to this Tribunal, got relief, will not entitle the applicants to the benefit of the said judgment of this Tribunal from the date, the judgment was passed. The application also appears to be highly belated. Therefore it is barred by limitation, and accordingly the same is dismissed.

5. It is made clear that dismissal of this O.A. will be not preclude the applicants for being considered for re-engagement in case the respondents choose to make fresh recruitment, if they (applicants) are otherwise eligible.

With these observations the application is dismissed but without any order as to costs.

(B.K. Singh)
Member (A)

(S.K. Dhaon)
Vice Chairman (J)

vpc