

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

13

O.A. No. 2325/2000  
M.A. No. 2756/2000

New Delhi this the 14th day of January 2002

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)  
Hon'ble Dr. A. Vedavalli, Member (J)

Suresh Chandra Misra,  
S/o Shri Ram Khelawan Misra,  
R/o 10, Mohalla Parao, Post Nanpar  
District Bahraich (U.P.),  
Presently at:  
H-24C Saket, New Delhi. Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Ravi P. Mehrotra)

45

1. Director General (Works),  
Ministry of Works & Housing,  
Central Public Works Department (CPWD),  
Nirman Bhawan,
2. Dy. Director of Administration III,  
Government of India,  
Directorate General of Work  
Central Public Works Department,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Dy. Secretary to Govt. of India,  
Directorate General of Works  
Central Public Works Department,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.

(By Advocate: Shri K.C.D. Gangwanil)

ORDER (ORAL)

Shri S. R. Adige, VC (A)

Applicant impugns respondents order dated 31.7.1998 and 30.8.1999 and seeks a direction to respondents to appoint him to the post of Junior Engineer (E) (CPWD) on the basis of his having completed Apprenticeship Training in the Department and in the light of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 12.1.1995.

2. We have heard Shri Rave P. Mehrotra, for the applicant and Shri K.C.D. Gangwani, for the Respondents.

3. A perusal of the aforesaid judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 12.1.1995 in U.P. State Road Transport Corporation & another v. U.P. Parivahan Nigam Shishukhs Berozgar Sangh and others (1995) 2 SCC 1 reveals that it had directed that the contents of para 12 of its judgement be kept in mind by respondents while dealing with the claims of apprenticeship trainees to get employment after successful completion of the training.

4. In the present case, we note that the applicant had completed his apprenticeship Training in July 1981, and manifestedly <sup>the</sup> abovementioned rule <sup>of</sup> ~~of~~ the Hon'ble Supreme Courts can not be construed to mean that an Apprentice who had completed his apprenticeship training <sup>over</sup> two decades ago can seek a direction compelling respondents to appoint him as Junior Engineer.

5. In the result we are unable to interfere in the matter and the O.A. accordingly dismissed. No costs.



(Dr. A. Vedavalli)  
Member (J)



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

\*Mittal\*