

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**



OA No. 1001/2020

and

OA No. 1032/2020

MA No. 1281/2020

New Delhi, this the 24th day of August, 2020

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)

OA No. 1001/2020

Vandana Manchanda
W/o Shri Raj Kumar Manchanda
Aged about 46 years
R/o 17/45, Second Floor
Near Rose Garden
Subhash Nagar, New Delhi-110027.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Ms. Pratima K. Gupta)

Versus

Delhi State Industrial Development Corporation (DSIDC)
through its Managing Director
N-36, Bombay Life Building
Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001. ...Respondent

(By Advocate : Ms. Richa Dhawan)



OA No. 1032/2020

1. Santosh Kumar
S/o Shri Durga Prasad
Aged about 33 years,
R/o A-61, Flat No.301, Third Floor,
Gali No.4, Madhu Vihar,
Shakurpur, Delhi 110 092.
2. Pradeep Kumar
S/o late Bansi Lal
Age 34 years,
R/o Jhuggi No.3075,
Anjay Basti, Timarpur, Behind Lohards,
Civil Lines, Delhi 110 052.
3. Hukum Singh
S/o Sh. Sube Singh
aged about 46 years,
R/o H. No.657/21, Gali No.7,
Narender Nagar, Sonipat,
Haryana.
4. Rajeev
S/o Shri Mehar Singh
Aged about 35 years,
R/o Khasra No.142, Plot No.458, 459,
Near Ashirvad Garden,
Village Kanjhawala,
Delhi 110 081.
5. Sunil Kumar Gond
S/o Sh. Kailash Gond,
Aged about 34 years,
R/o Village Banihana, Post Office Ranihawa,
Beital Pur, UP 2742201.



6. Ram Dayal Gond
S/o Sh. Bechai Prasad Gond
Aged about 38 years,

R/o H. No.928, Phase-III,
J. J. Cluster Sarita Vihar,
Delhi 110 076.

7. Kishor Kumar Bhuyan
S/o Sh. Kangali Charan Bhuyan
Aged about 42 years,
R/o H. No.2339/4, Block L-1,
Sangam Vihar,
Delhi 110 062.

8. Rajesh Yadav
S/o Sh. Baij Nath Yadav
Aged about 40 years,
R/o H. No.75, Khel Gaun Road,
Shahpour Jaat, Delhi 110 049.

9. Vandana Bedi
W/o Sh. Sumit Bedi
Aged about 39 years,
R/o Plot No.35, Flat No.8,
Patel Garden, Extension Savek Par,
Near Dwarka Mor, Uttam Nagar,
New Delhi 110 059.

10. Sachi Sahu
S/o Sh. Nrusingh Charan Sahoo
Aged about 37 years,
R/o Village Haladia Patna,
Benipur, Kendrapara,
Odisha 754292.



11. Sumit Gupta
S/o Sh. Kailash Kumar Gupta
Aged about 39 years,
R/o D-1, Hakikat Rai Road,
Adarsh Nagar, Shanjarpur,
Delhi 110 033.

12. Pradeep Kumar Mallick
S/o Sh. Gopal Sharan Mallick,
Aged about 48 years,
R/o 432 Ground Floor, Sunlight Colony,
2, Ashram, Jungpura,
Delhi 110 014.

13. Sonu
S/o Late Rattan Singh
Aged about 42 years,
R/o H. No.175, Villatge Badsa,
Jhajjar, Haryana 124105.

14. Subodh Kumar
S/o Sh. Ram Bharose
Aged about 32 years,
R/o H. No.B-3254, Gali No.84,
Sant Nagar, Burari,
Delhi 110 084.

15. Mehtab Alam
S/o Sh. Chaudhary Salauddin
Aged about 38 years,
R/o H. No.12A/55K, Nehar Bazar Road No.66,
Mauj Pur, Delhi 110 053.

... Applicants.

(By Advocate : Mrs. Pratima K. Gupta)

Vs.



Delhi State Industrial Development
Corporation (DSIDC)
Through its Managing Director
N-36, Bombay Life Building,
Connaught Circus
New Delhi 110 001.

.... Respondent.

(By Advocate : Ms. Richa Dhawan)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :-

The applicant in OA No. 1001/2020 is being engaged as Junior Stenographer in the Delhi State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (DSIIDC) on contractual basis in the year 2008, and the applicants in OA No. 1032/2020 are stated to be engaged as Multi Tasking Staff (MTS) from the year 2004 to 2006. Their grievance is that though they have served the Organization for more than a decade, their services are not being regularized and even minimum wages are not being paid. It is stated that several representations were made in this behalf, but there is no action from the respondents. The applicants contend that the



denial of relief to them is contrary to law and even the policy, which is in force, framed by the Government of Delhi.

2. We heard Ms. Pratima K. Gupta, learned counsel for the applicants and Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned counsel for the respondents, at the stage of admission.

3. The applicants in both the OAs are working in the DSIIDC through the medium of placement agency. The conditions of their service and the nature of rights are not immediately before us. Much would depend upon the terms of engagement and the policy that is in vogue in the respondent- organization. Though a specific prayer is made to direct the respondents to formulate a policy in this behalf, it is not for the Tribunal to embark on that. It is for the respondents to decide, whether or not to frame a policy. However, the representations made by the applicants need to be considered. If what is demanded by them accords with



law, that needs to be considered. If, on the other hand, the demand does not fit into the existing legal frame, appropriate reply needs to be given. In any way, the representations cannot be kept pending indefinitely.

4. We, therefore, dispose of the OAs directing the respondents to pass orders on the representations submitted by the applicants within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. We make it clear that if the applicants so choose, they can supplement their representations by fresh material.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman