CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.2050/1990

New Delhi, This the 10th Day of October 1994

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur,Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam,Member (A)

1.   Shri Suresh Chand
     s/o Shri Teju
     aged 20 years,
     Labourer,(Daily Rated)
     Staff Selection Commission
     Block No.12, CGO Complex
     Lodhi Road, New Delhi -3
     Q No.90, Block No.12,
     Lady Hardinge Hospital
     Puchkuin Road
     New Delhi.

2.   Shri Ramji Lal
     S/o Shri Leela Dhar
     aged about 22 years
     Casual Labourer,
     Staff Selection Commission
     Block No.12, CGO Complex
     Lodhi Road, New Delhi-3
     R/o Garrage No.118
     North Avenue
     New Delhi-1.

3.   Shri Biswanath Prasad
     S/o Manki Prasad
     aged 21 years
     Casual Labourer
     Staff Selection Commission
     Block No.12, CGO complex
     Lodhi Road, New Delhi-3
     R/o 236, Lodi Road Complex
     New Delhi -3-.

By Shri N Amresh proxy counsel to   ...Applicant
   Shri Ex-Joseph,Advocate
                         Versus

1.   The Union of India through the
     Secretary to the Government
     Department of Personnel & Training
     North Block, New Delhi.

2.   The Staff Selection Commission
     through the Chairman
     Block No.12,CGO Complex
     Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

                                        ..Respondents

   By Shri Vijay Mehta, Advocate for
      Shri N S Mehta, Advocate

                    O R D E R (Oral)

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur, Chairman

1.   This application under section 19 of the

Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 has been made by

                                              •2/

three persons namely Shri Suresh Chand, Shri Ramji Lal
and Shri Biswanath Prasad. The reliefs claimed in the
application are that the respondents may be commanded
to continue the applicants in service and to regularise
their services through Staff Selection Commission, the
respondent No.2.

2.   In the application it is mentioned that applicant
No.1 was appointed from 3.3.1989 and he was disengaged
on 30.8.1989 and thereafter he was re-engaged on
4.4.90 and was continuing in service when the present
application was moved. In respect of applicant No.2
it is stated that he was appointed on 14.6.90 and
was continuing in service. As regards applicant No.3
it has been mentioned that he was engaged on 19.7.89
and disengaged on 17.1.90 and was re-engaged on
19.9.90 and was continuing in the service. The
applicants case is that their services are threatened
    be
to/disengaged in pursuance of the policy decision
taken by the administration.

3.   In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of
the respondents it has been denied that the applicants
were continuing in service on the date the
application was made. In respect of applicant
No.1 it is stated that he was disengaged on 30.9.90
and in respect of applicant No.2 it is stated that
he was disengaged with effect from 8.10.90. It
        that in
appears/more or less similar circumstances
Shri Kameshwar Prasad who was also working
with Respondent No.2 had moved original
application No.948/90 decided on 16.9.90 by this
Bench of the Tribunal. In that case it was
directed that the respondents shall prepare
a list of persons engaged as casual labourers

..4

from time to time according to the length of
service put in by them in that category and that
this list shall be used for regularisation in the
order of seniority reflected in the list. A copy
of this order has been annexued A-2 to the original
application. The learned counsel for the respondents
states that in compliance of the judgement of the
Tribunal a list has been prepared and further
steps are being taken in accordance with the said
list.

4.   In view of the statement of the learned counsel
for the respondents we direct that the case of the
applicants for engagement and regularisation / be
considered in accordance with the scheme prepared
by the respondent No.2. Interim order if any
operating shall stand discharged. However, if
in view of the scheme prepared by the respondents
the applicants are entitled to continue in service
they shall remain in service.   The OA is disposed
of with the above direction. There shall be no
order as to costs.

P.J.16

(P.T.THIRUVENGADAM)   (S.C.Mathur)
Member(A)   Chairman
10-10-94   10-10-94

LCP