

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

Regn.No. OA-1869/90

Date of decision: 13.11.1992

Shri Aditya Kumar Juyal Applicant

Versus

The Director General, Respondents
Doordarshan, New Delhi
and Another

For the Applicant None

For the Respondents Shri M.L. Verma, Advocate

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr.P.K. Kartha, Vice Chairman(J)
The Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, 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
Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman)

We have gone through the records of the case carefully. The short point for consideration is whether the applicant, who has worked as a Casual Labourer in the Office of the respondents for a period of three months from 1.12.1989 to 28.2.1990, is entitled to continue in service as a Casual Labourer. The services of the applicant were terminated by verbal order after the period of engagement for three months expired. According

to the applicant, the respondents have adopted a practice of replacing one set of casual labourers by another set after the former had put in a period of service of three months.

2. The respondents have stated in their counter-affidavit that the applicant himself has replaced a batch of casual labourers engaged earlier than him.

3. After considering the contentions of both sides, we are of the opinion that the applicant has only the limited right of being considered for engagement as a casual labourer, in case the respondents need the services of a casual labourer and in preference to persons with lesser length of service and outsiders. We order and direct accordingly. The application is disposed of on the above lines. There will be no order as to costs.

D.N. Dhundiya
(D.N. Dhundiya) 13/11/92
Administrative Member

Partha
13/11/92
(P.K. Kartha)
Vice-Chairman(Jud1.)