

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

DA No. 1792/2000

New Delhi: this the 8th day of AUGUST, 2001.

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

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI MEMBER (J)

1. Dr. U.N. Raina,
 S/o Shri Mohan Lal Raina,
 R/o A-41, Indira Enclave,
 Neb Sarai,
 New Delhi - 68.
 Senior Time Scale Officers in IB(P)S,
 DG, AIR,
 New Delhi.

2. K. Subramaniam,
 S/o Late Sh. Krishna Murthy,
 R/o 12A/26, W.E.A. Karol Bagh,
 New Delhi.
 STS Officer, AIR,
 New Delhi.

3. Smt. Devika Moktan,
 R/o E-216, Pragati Vihar,
 Lodi Road,
 New Delhi.

Junior Time Scale Officer (Regular),
 Junior Door Darshan,
 New Delhi

... Applicants.

(Applicants in person)

Versus

Union of India,
 Rep. by its Secretary,
 Ministry of Information and
 Broadcasting,
 New Delhi.

2. Director General,
 All India Radio, Parliament Street,
 New Delhi-1

3. Director General,
 Door Darshan,
 Mandi House,
 New Delhi-1

... Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri A.K. Bhardwaj)

ORDER

S.R. Adige, VC(A):

Applicants impugn respondents' order dated

2

25.8.2000 (Annexure-P1) qua themselves, terminating their adhoc appointment in Programme Management Cadre of AIR in Senior Time Scale of Indian Broadcasting (Programme) Service, and reverting them to their substantive posts of Programme Executive.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The impugned order dated 25.8.2000 as well as respondents' reply clearly state that the same has been issued in implementation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated 30.7.99 in SLP No.21747/97 UOI Vs. Shri Chetan S.Naik and connected cases.

4. This specific assertion of respondents in their reply has not been denied by applicants in any rejoinder filed by them.

5. During hearing applicants who were present and argued their case in person contended that while implementing the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment (supra) applicants need not have been reverted, and supernumerary posts could have been created to accommodate them, but there is no specific direction contained in the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment (supra) requiring respondents not to revert applicants by the creation of supernumerary posts.

6. It could also be contended that applicants should have been given a reasonable opportunity to show cause before they were actually reverted, but they have not been able to furnish any material to establish that even if a show cause notice had been given the ultimate position would have been any different.

7. The impugned orders are dated 25.8.2000 and it is not denied that they came into effect soonafter

and applicants are presently working on their substantive posts to which they have been reverted.

8. In the particular facts and circumstances of this case, the OA warrants no interference. It is dismissed. No costs.

A. Vedavalli
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
MEMBER (J)

S.R. Adige
(S.R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

/ug/