

28

In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi

Regn. Nos.:

Date: 4.5.1990.

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. CCP- 158/89 In DA-1011/89 | 9. CCP- 175/89 In DA- 859/87 |
| 2. CCP- 168/89 In DA-1411/89 | 10. CCP- 176/89 In DA- 603/87 |
| 3. CCP- 169/89 In DA- 590/89 | 11. CCP- 177/89 In DA-1855/87 |
| 4. CCP- 170/89 In DA- 398/87 | 12. CCP- 197/89 In DA-1418/87 |
| 5. CCP- 171/89 In DA-1325/87 | 13. CCP- 203/89 In DA-1740/87 |
| 6. CCP- 172/89 In DA- 193/87 | 14. CCP- 205/89 In DA-1171/87 |
| 7. CCP- 173/89 In DA-1341/87 | 15. CCP- 218/89 In DA-1513/87 |
| 8. CCP- 174/89 In DA-1101/87 | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Shri Shivaji Mishra & 11 Others | Petitioners |
| 2. Shri Vipin Behari Lal & Others | |
| 3. Shri Sushil Kumar Srivastava | |
| 4. Shri Surendra Kumar | |
| 5. Shri D. Thangavelu & Others | |
| 6. Shri Devender Kumar | |
| 7. Shri Ravinder Singh & Others | |
| 8. Shri Mahesh Kumar Singh & Others | |
| 9. Shri Abhai Kumar Sinha | |
| 10. Kumari Saroj & Others | |
| 11. Shri Dhirender Mohan Garg | |
| 12. Shri Tripurari Jha | |
| 13. Shri Rajesh Sharma | |
| 14. Shri Vinod Kumar Sharma | |
| 15. Shri Sandeep Kumar Sharma | |

Versus

| | |
|---|---|
| Secretary, Ministry of Railways and Others | Respondents |
| For the Petitioners | Shri Anis Suhrawardy, Counsel for Petitioner No.1 |
| | Shri B. S. Maini, Counsel for Petitioner Nos. 2-15. |
| For the Respondents | Smt. Shashi Kiran, Counsel for Respondents 1, 2, 7, 11 and 13. |
| | Shri Jagjit Singh, Counsel for Respondents 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 10, 12, 14 and 15. |
| | Shri O. N. Moolri, Counsel for Respondent No.5. |

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (Judl.)
Hon'ble Shri D.K. Chakravorty, Administrative Member.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to
see the judgement? Yes

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? No

(Judgement of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble
Shri P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman)

These petitions have been filed by the petitioners
on the ground that the respondents have not complied with

the directions contained in the Tribunal's judgement dated

23.5.1989 in a batch of cases dealing with the termination

of services of the Mobile Booking Clerks (Miss Usha Kumari

Anand & Others Vs. Union of India).

2. In para.37 of the Tribunal's judgement dated

23.5.1989, it was observed that all the applicants had

been engaged as Mobile Booking Clerks before 17.11.1986

and that in the interest of justice, they deserved to be

reinstated in service. Those who have put in continuous

service of more than 120 days, would be entitled to

temporary status, with all the attendant benefits. They

were to be considered for regularisation and permanent

absorption in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme

laid down by the respondents. In view of this, the

respondents were directed as follows:-

(i) To reinstate the applicants to the posts of

Mobile Booking Clerk from the respective

dates on which their services were terminated

if possible, and to consider them for regularisation and

absorption after verification of their qual-

ifications for the same. If any person had

become overage in the meanwhile, the respondents

were directed to relax the age limit.

After (ii) In reinstatement, the respondents were directed

to confer temporary status on the applicants

in the OAs mentioned in para 38(ii) of the judgement, if, on verification of their records it was found that they had put in

four months of continuous service as Mobile

Booking Clerks and treat them as temporary

employees. They will also be entitled to

regularisation under the Scheme.

3. The Tribunal had fixed a time-limit of three months for implementation of the judgement insofar as the reinstatement of the applicants were concerned. With regard to the other directions, no specific time-limit was laid down therein.

4. The time-limit stipulated in the judgement expired on 23.8.1989. The respondents did not produce any stay order issued by the Supreme Court staying the operation of our judgement. In some of these cases, the respondents had filed Special Leave Petitions in the Supreme Court, but no stay had been granted by the Supreme Court. We have been told during the hearing of the case that the SLPs filed in the Supreme Court were dismissed in November, 1989. The respondents did not implement the judgement until these petitions had been filed in the Tribunal and orders had been passed calling upon them to comply with the directions contained in the judgement. In some of these petitions, we had passed orders to the effect that the petitioners would be entitled to salary and allowances from 23.8.1989 till the judgement is fully complied with. In some others, no such order was specifically made while in yet some others, it had been observed that the petitioners would be entitled for salary from 15.11.1989, the date when the Supreme Court

Nonetheless, the court held that court action has to be initiated and the previous court had dismissed the SLPs. Taking a total view of all these applications, including the fact that the applicants were poor and belong to the lower strata of society who had to undergo much hardship during the period when they were out of employment, without any compensation, we are of the opinion that all the petitioner would be entitled to salary and allowances from 23.8.1989, i.e., even after the expiry of three months stipulated in the judgement.

5. At the time of hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioners stated that all the petitioners have been and are being paid the minimum wage to be expected, i.e., **reinstated in service. To that extent, the judgement of the** **petitioners has been complied with. The remaining grievances** **which were highlighted by Shri Anis Suhrawardy and Shri B.S.** **Maine were that the petitioners are being paid only Rs. 2/-** **and even senior-most employees get Rs. 12/- per hour, amounting to Rs. 18/- per day, while even illiterate** **workers employed as daily-wagers get Rs. 27/- per day.**

Secondly, temporary status has not been conferred on the petitioners, as directed in the judgement. Thirdly, they have not been paid the arrears w.e.f. 23.8.1989. Smt. Shashi Kiran, learned Counsel for some of these cases, stated that the petitioners were getting only Rs. 2/- per hour when their services had been terminated, that orders regarding conferment of temporary status and regularisation will be issued after verifying the service particulars of the petitioners, and that the arrears will also be paid expeditiously.

Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri O.N. Moolri, Counsel for the remaining cases, stated that payment of arrears has been made to almost all the petitioners. The arrears have already been made to many of them.

6. We have carefully gone through the records of the case and have heard the learned counsel for both the parties. While we have to take note of the magnitude of the task before the respondents in view of the large number

of persons involved, we do not see any justification for not complying with the judgement of the Tribunal dated 23.5.1989, in letter and spirit. The respondents were well within their rights to move the Supreme Court and we do not feel that they have been at fault in doing so with SLPs which they did. At the same time, the mere fact that they chose to file SLPs, did not justify the non-implementation of our judgement. As the petitioners have been reinstated in service, the respondents have substantially complied with the judgement and we do not consider it appropriate to keep these petitions alive. In the conspectus of the facts and circumstances of the cases, we dispose of these petitions with the following directions to the respondents:-

(i) The respondents shall verify whether all the applicants in these cases have been reinstated as Mobile Booking Clerks and if any one has been left out, they should also be appointed forthwith.

(ii) The respondents shall complete task of verification of the service particulars of all the petitioners and confer temporary status on those who have put in 4 months of continuous service as Mobile Booking Clerks as expeditiously as possible but in no event, later than four months from the date of communication of this order. We, however, make it clear that the fact that the Tribunal directed payment of salary and allowances to the petitioners for the period from 23.8.1989, will not entitle them to count that period for reckoning the period of four months of continuous service.

Ch

(iii) The respondents shall pay to the petitioners arrears of pay and allowances for the period from 23.8.1989 till their reinstatement in all these cases. Those who have not been so paid, shall be paid as expeditiously as possible, but in no event, later than four months from the communication of this order.

(iv) Those who have been found to have acquired temporary status after verification of the records, would be entitled to all the benefits to which Railway employees acquiring temporary status are entitled to under the Indian Railway Establishment Manual and other relevant orders and instructions issued by the respondents.

(v) The regularisation and absorption of the petitioners should also be completed expeditiously as and when they fulfil the conditions prescribed for the same. The service already put in before they were terminated would also count for the purpose of regularisation and absorption.

7. The CCPs are disposed of with the above observations and directions. The notices of contempt are discharged. The parties will bear their own costs.

8. Let a copy of this order be placed in all the 15 case files mentioned above.

(D.K. Chakravorty)
Administrative Member

4/5/890

(P.K. Kartha)
Vice-Chairman(Judl.)