

6

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.272/94
MA 1600/94

NEW DELHI THIS THE 8TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1994

HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SHRI P.T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (A)

Smt Usha Rani,
Ex-L.D.C.-cum-typist
D-2/92, Janakpuri
New Delhi-58

...Applicant

By Advocate : Shri J.C. Madan

Versus

1. Union of India, through
Secretary,
Ministry of Law, Justice & Company Affairs,
Shastry Bhavan,
NEW DELHI.
2. The Regional Directorate
Company Law Board
Northern Region
10/499-B, Allen Gaung
Khalasi Line,
KANPUR.
3. The Registrar of Companies,
(Delhi & Haryana)
Parivarayan Bhavan,
CGO Complex, Lodi Road,
NEW DELHI.

...Respondents

By Advocate : Shri K.C. Sharma

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J)

It appears from the record that earlier O.A. 1372/88 was filed by the applicant which was disposed of by the Principal Bench on 8.02.91 with the direction contained in Para 27 the order of termination of the applicant dated 20.09.87 was quashed, and further to engage applicant to the post of L.D.C.-cum-typist on adhoc basis, such engagement to continue by the respondents till regularly selected candidate approved by the S.S.C. is appointed. The respondents, thereafter by the impugned order dated 8.04.93 in compliance

Jc

with the direction in O.A.1372/88, on the arrival of new selected & recommended candidates from S.S.C. terminated the services of the applicant which were on adhoc basis as per direction of the judgement in the O.A.1372/82. The applicant has file this O.A. aggrieved by that order which is opposed by the respondent's counsel and they have also file a reply to which a rejoinder has also been filed. No interim direction was issued to the respondents.

2. The matter was ripe for hearing on admission today but the learned counsel Shri J.C. Madan made a request that the applicant wants to make certain more averments and, therefore, does not want to press this application, which may be allowed to be withdrawn. The counsel for the respondents, however, did not oppose the withdrawl but argued that since the pleadings are complete, the subsequent applicant can only file the application, according to law and subject to law of limitation. This is not disputed by the counsel for the applicant.

3. The applicant is permitted to withdraw this application with liberty to file a fresh one subject to law of limitation.

P. T. Thiruvengadam

(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)
MEMBER (A)

J. P. Sharma

(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)