

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.2300/2000

Monday, this the 20th day of August, 2001

Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (Admn)

Shri Jai Parkash
S/O Shri Mukhtiar Singh
R/O F-1775, Netaji Nagar,
New Delhi.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary
Ministry of Works and Housing
Directorate of Estates
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Superintending Engineer
Delhi Central Electrical Circle-VII
CPWD, East Block-I, R.K. Puram
New Delhi-22.
3. Executive Engineer
Division No.V,
CPWD, Sewa Bhavan, 8th Floor
R.K.Puram, New Delhi.
4. Executive Engineer
CPWD
Electrical Division No.17
Trikoot Building-II,
R.K. Puram, Ne Delhi-110 022.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri P.P.Relan for Shri J.B. Mudgil)

O R D E R (ORAL)

On 10.8.2001, when this case came up for hearing, it was clearly laid down that if the learned counsel for the applicant did not turn up on the next date of hearing which is 20.8.2001, the case would be decided on the basis of the pleadings. Accordingly, I will proceed to decide the case on the basis of pleadings and after hearing the learned proxy counsel for the respondents.

2. In his OA, the applicant has stated that it is not known as to how the public interest has been served by---

2

(2)

cancelling the allotment of Quarter No.F-1775, Netaji Nagar, New Delhi, Type-II by an office order dated 25.9.2000. The applicant has lived in that same house for 18 years and has about five years to go before attaining the age of superannuation. He has already vacated the quarter. According to the applicant, the respondents have not assigned any reason in support of their contention that the applicant was an unauthorized occupant of the aforesaid quarter. I have considered the matter and find that it will be difficult to dispute the ground taken by the respondents at the time of issuance of the various notices seeking vacation of the aforesaid quarter and by the same token, it is not possible to dispute the claim made on behalf of the respondents that the aforesaid order of cancellation of allotment has been passed wholly in the public interest. The grounds which have necessitated issuance of notices are fairly stated in the notice dated 8.12.1995 (Annexure A-3). The ground stated therein can well be taken for ordering cancellation in the public interest.

3. In the circumstances, I do not find anything wrong with the impugned order dated 25.9.2000. The OA accordingly fails and is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.



(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

/sunil/