

(4)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No. 1540 of 2000

New Delhi, this the 12th day of December, 2000

HON'BLE MR. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (JUDL)

Mangtoo Ram
S/o Shri Harbhajan
R/o Q.No.806, Sewa Nagar
Jhuggi No.3
New Delhi

-APPLICANT

(By Advocate: Sh. Gyaneshwar proxy for Sh. U. Srivastava)

Versus

Union of India through

1. The Secretary,
Cabinet Secretariat
Govt. of India, New Delhi
2. The Director (Admn.),
Govt. of India
Cabinet Secretariat
Special Protection Group
No.1, Safdarjung Lane
New Delhi.

-RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: Shri J.B. Mudgil)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (Judl)

In this case, applicant has prayed for the following reliefs:

- "(a) declaring the inactions of the Respondents for not considering the case of the applicant for re-engagement as casual labourer against juniors and outsiders as illegal;
- (b) directing the respondents to re-engage the applicant as a casual labourer against juniors and outsiders, keeping in view previous satisfactory services of the applicant; and
- (c) directing the respondents to decide the claim of the applicant which is pending before them in the shape of representation dated Dec. 96 which has been submitted by the applicant in compliance of vide Tribunal's order dated 5.11.96 in O.A. No. 815/93."



2. Applicant had earlier filed an O.A. 815/93 which was disposed of on 6.11.96 with the directions that "applicant may make a representation setting out his grievances before second respondent and that respondent shall pass a speaking order on the representation within three months from the date of receipt of the representation." Counsel for the applicant has submitted that in compliance of Tribunal's directions, applicant had submitted a representation to respondents and the same has not been disposed of as yet.

3. Applicant has submitted in para 5.5 of his O.A. that it had come to his knowledge from some reliable sources that the respondents had engaged some freshers and outsiders and his case had been ignored, however, I find that he has not mentioned the names of those juniors and outsiders who have been engaged ignoring his claim. Respondents in their reply, have also denied receipt of any representation which the applicant is claiming to have made to them in compliance of directions in O.A. 815/93.

4. Under the circumstances, I am of the opinion that this O.A. is quite vague and is not maintainable. However, if the respondents decide to engage fresh casual labourers, applicant shall be given preference over juniors and outsiders.

5. O.A. stands disposed of with the above directions. No costs.


(KULDIP SINGH)
MEMBER (JUDL)

/dinesh/