

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH.

O.A.NO.97/94

18

Hon'ble Shri R.K.AHOJA, MEMBER(A)

New Delhi, this 30th day of September, 1996

1. Shri Bankey Lal
S/o Shri Thakur Parsad
r/o P1-1085, Sultanpuri
NEW DELHI - 110 041.
2. Shri Dinesh Kumar
s/o Shri Sohan Lal
r/o B-328, Indrapuri
J.J. Colony
New Delhi - 110 012.
3. Shri Ram Sabad
s/o Shri Girdhari Lal
r/o House No.178
Village-Shalimar
P.O. Ashok Vihar
NEW DELHI - 110 052.
4. Shri Hori Lal
s/o Shri Mukand Lal
r/o D-240, Laxmi Nagar
Delhi - 110 092.
5. Shri Krishan Kumar
s/o Shri Mohar Singh
r/o House No.178
Shalimar
P.O. Ashok Vihar
Delhi - 110 052.
6. Shri Muneshwar Yadav
s/o Shri Gopal Parsad
r/o Jhuggi No.11
Safdarjung Flyover Bridge
New Delhi - 110 003.
7. Shri Indrasan Tyagi
s/o Shri Ramanand Ram
r/o Sewak Sangh
Kingsway Camp
DELHI - 110 009.

.... Applicants

(By Shri Ashok Aggarwal, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Govt. of National Capital Territory
of Delhi
through Chief Secretary
5, Shyam Nath Marg
DELHI.
2. The Development Commissioner
Govt. of National Capital
Territory of Delhi,

Contd....2/-

22

5/9, Under Hill Road
Delhi - 110 054.

... Respondents

19

(By Shri Ajesh Luthra, proxy of
Ms. Jyotsna Kaushik, Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

Hon'ble Shri R.K. Ahooja, Member(A)

The applicants, seven in number, are in the employment of the respondents from various dates. They were initially appointed on daily wages but were later regularised w.e.f. 01.03.1991. The applicants' claim that they are working as Malis and in terms of various Government orders, they are entitled to the benefits of 'Uniform, Washing and Cycle Allowances.

2. The respondents deny this claim and have submitted in their reply that all the applicants have been appointed only as labourers in compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.9609-10 of 1983 (Nioder Bors. Vs. Delhi Administration & Others) and SLP No.98, 99, 216, 938 and 940/88. As such they are not entitled to the aforesaid allowances.

3. Today when the matter came up for hearing, the learned counsel for the applicants submitted that he had sought the relief on the basis of the Judgment of the Supreme Court in Rattan Lal & Others Vs. Lt. Governor & Others, 1992(4) SCC 117. Further, on perusal of that Judgment, he finds that the same is not applicable to the case of the applicants. In view of the above, he does not wish to press this matter further. Accordingly, the application is dismissed as not pressed. No costs.

R.K. Ahooja
(R.K. AHOOGA)
MEMBER(A)

/rao/