

9

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

REGN.NO. D.A. 201/87.

DATE OF DECISION: 4th August, 1992.

Nauratanmal Mehta.

... Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents.

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.  
THE HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER(A).

For the Petitioner.

... None.

For the Respondents.

... None.

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Malimath,  
Chairman)

None appeared either for the petitioner or for the respondents. As this is a very old case, we consider it appropriate to look into the record and dispose of this matter on merits.


2. The petitioner was promoted on ad hoc basis pending selection to the post, by an order dated 21.6.1985. He has approached the Tribunal praying for an injunction restraining the respondents from reverting him and for a direction to the respondents not to fill-up the vacancies in such a manner as to exceed the quota reserved for members of the Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe and other consequential and incidental reliefs.

3. The petitioner having been given promotion only on ad hoc basis pending selection and appointment on regular basis, no legitimate grievance<sup>can</sup>/be made about the possibility of his reversion. He having earned only ad hoc promotion, he has not acquired<sup>title to the</sup>/post. The respondents have taken the stand

10

that ad hoc arrangement was made as the vacancy was meant to be filled up by direct recruitment by the prescribed Selection Board. It is also pointed out that the petitioner not having even applied for the post which has to be filled up by direct recruitment cannot be regarded as an aggrieved person to come to the Tribunal with this grievance. Looked at from any angle, we are satisfied that the petitioner has not made out any case for interference. This petition fails and is, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

SRD  
040892

  
( I.K. RASGOTRA )  
MEMBER(A)

  
( V.S. MALIMATH )  
CHAIRMAN