

-19-

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
DELHI.

C.C.P. No. 210/90
in
O.A. No. 906/1991.

Date of decision: February 5, 1991.

Smt. Krishna Devi

....

Petitioner-Applicant

Vs.

Shri S.M. Vaish,
General Manager,
Northern Railway,
New Delhi

Shri U.R. Chopra,
Division Railway Manager,
Northern Railway,
Bikaner.

Respondents.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAV BANERJI, CHAIRMAN.

HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER (A).

For the petitioner-applicant ...

Shri G.D. Bhandari,
Counsel.

For the respondents ...

Ms. Shashi Kiran,
Counsel.

(Order of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble
Mr. Justice Amitav Banerji, Chairman).

We have heard Shri G.D. Bhandari, learned counsel
for the petitioner-applicant and Ms. Shashi Kiran, learned
counsel for the respondents.

Ms. Shashi Kiran stated that Smt. Krishna Devi,
the petitioner-applicant has been medically examined by
Sr. D.M.O. Rewari against reserved vacancy of handicapped
quota and was declared fit on 15.1.1991. Thereafter
she had been appointed as substitute Waterwoman grade
750-940 (RPS) vide Office letter No. PCM/373E/Comm1/HW/
Krishna Devi dated 17.1.1991 against the reserved vacancy
of handicapped quota. She submitted that the petitioner-

applicant will be called to appear in the selection for Group 'D' posts against the handicapped quota in future.

She submitted that the order passed by the Tribunal in O.A. 906/1987 has thus been implemented and the notice issued to the respondents be discharged.

She has also filed a reply to the C.C.P. signed by Shri U.R.Chopra, Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Bikaner, respondent No.2.

Shri G.D.Bhandari, learned counsel for the petitioner-applicant admitted that the petitioner has been appointed as substitute Waterwoman as stated above. He, however, contended that she was entitled to the back wages for the period during which she was kept away from service after the decision of the Tribunal dated 17.5.1989. He urged that the respondents had not taken her in service until the order dated 15.1.1991 was passed and thus the petitioner-applicant is entitled to be compensated by awarding her back wages.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we are satisfied that the notice issued to the respondents is liable to be discharged. The C.C.P. was filed to implement the order passed by the Bench in OA906/1987 dated 17.5.1989. There was delay, but ultimately the order has been implemented and consequently, there is no further cause to continue the C.C.P. As regards the prayer for awarding back wages or compensation, we are not impressed by the contention made on behalf of the petitioner-applicant. Substantial justice has been done in this

case and no further orders are necessary to be passed. Consequently, the notice issued to the respondents in the C.C.P. is discharged and the C.C.P. is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

Subhash
(I.K.RASGOTRA)
MEMBER (A)
5.2.1991.

AB
(AMITAV BANERJI)
CHAIRMAN
5.2.1991.

SKS