

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

O.A. No. 1243 of 1994

New Delhi, dated this the 16th August, 1999.

Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)

(11)

S/Shri

1. Bhogi Ram,  
S/o Shri Ram Bharose,  
Ticket Collector, Palam-Rly. Station,  
R/o Qr. No. T-3, Palam Railway Colony,  
Palam Colony,  
New Delhi-110045.
2. Shyam Lal Sharma,  
Ticket Collector,  
R/o Block No. 102-C  
Railway Colony,  
Sirsa, Haryana.
3. Mahabir Singh Chhoker,  
S/o Shri Jiwan Ram,  
TTE,  
R/o T-26/H, Railway Colony,  
Hissar, Haryana. . . . . Applicants

(None appeared)

Versus

1. Union of India through  
the General Manager,  
Northern Railway,  
Baroda House,  
New Delhi.
2. The Secretary,  
Railway Board, Rail Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
3. The Divl. Railway Manager,  
Northern Railway, Bikaner Division,  
Bikaner (Rajasthan)
4. Shri Gurdev Singh,  
Fitter Mistry,  
Northern Railway,  
Sirsa, Haryana.
5. Shri Sriniwas,  
H.S. Fitter ii,  
Delhi Sarai Rohilla,  
Northern Railway,  
Delhi. . . . . Respondents

(None appeared)

(7)

ORDER (Oral)

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

(12)

Applicants impugn Respondents' order dated 18.5.94 (Ann. A/3) redeploying ~~of~~ the surplus staff in the Ticket Checking cadre. Para 3(iii) of the Railway Board's Circular dated 21.4.94 (Annexure A/1) is also impugned.

2. None appeared for parties when the case was called out even on the second call.

3. This is a very old case of 1994 and has been listed at Sl. No.7 in the list of regular hearing cases. Therefore, we have decided to dispose of the same on the basis of available materials on record.

4. Respondents in their reply have taken the preliminary plea of lack of jurisdiction and limitation in respect of the orders dated 21.4.89. That apart Respondents have pointed out that the redeployment of surplus staff is a policy matter ~~evolved~~ after necessary discussions with the recognised Railway Federations, and the policy instructions have been in force for about 10 years.

5. We see nothing in the impugned orders which can be ~~said to be~~ to be illegal or arbitrary or violative

A

3

(13)

of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution which warrants our judicial interference.

6. The O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

  
(Kuldip Singh)

Member (J)

  
(S.R. Adige)  
Vice Chairman (A)

/GK/