

(A)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No.1011/94

New Delhi this the 5th Day of September, 1994.

Sh. N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman (A)
Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

1. Yamuna Chowdhary,
S/o Sh. Nathuni Chowdhary,
R/o 1B, Sector IV, Raj Bazar,
New Delhi-110 001.

2. Jitendra Singh,
S/o Sh. Atma Ram,
R/o 24-D, Aram Bagh,
New Delhi-110 001.

...Applicants

(By Advocate Sh. I.C. Sudhir)

Versus

Union of India through
the Secretary, Department
of Supply, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.

...Respondent

ORDER(ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan:-

On the last occasion we had observed on 7.6.94 that the applicants have not made out any case as to why they apprehend their reversion to the Group 'D' posts.

2. We have heard the learned counsel. The applicants are Group 'D' employees promoted as LDCs on ad hoc basis. The Annexure A-1 order dated 5.1.93 states that their ad hoc appointment in this capacity will continue for a further period upto 31.3.93 or till regular LDCs become available or till the stay order is vacated by the Tribunal, whichever is earlier. In reply to our query, the learned counsel states that the applicants have been continuing after 31.3.93 without any further order. They have sought for a direction to the respondents to regularise their service as LDC and other consequential reliefs.


5


3. Having seen the Annexure A-1 Order, which makes it clear that the tenure is limited to the date until regular LDCs become available or the date whenever the said order is vacated by the Tribunal we felt that the applicant has approached this Tribunal rather pre-maturely. Even today, the learned counsel for the respondents is unable to satisfy us as to how they entertain this apprehension.

4. The learned counsel requests that a notice be issued to the respondents, particularly when in a similar matter, the Annexure A-2 judgement dated 12.4.91 has been issued.

5. We have seen that case. That is a case where the applicants have been reverted and the reversion was challenged.

6. In the circumstances, we find that this application is pre-mature. Accordingly, it is dismissed. We make it clear that this will not stand in the way of the applicants from seeking appropriate reliefs, if and when their grievance arise.


(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)


(N.V. Krishnan)
Vice-Chairman

'Sanju'