

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 2478/90

199

~~ExAxxNoxx~~DATE OF DECISION 20.12.90.Shri Surjeet Kumar Mehta~~Petitioner~~ ApplicantShri O.P. SoodAdvocate for the ~~Petitioner(s)~~
Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

Respondents

Sh. P. Kantanga, Head Clerk

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. KARTHA, VICE-CHAIRMAN(J)

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K. CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER(A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? *No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? *No*

ORDER

(Order of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble
Mr.P.K.Kartha, Vice-Chairman(J))

We have heard the learned of the applicant and the representative of the respondents on the question of admission and interim relief granted to the applicant on 6.12.90. The applicant has prayed in this application that a direction should be issued to the respondents to regularise his services on the post of Driver and that the impugned order dated 20.11.90 be set aside and quashed. He has also prayed for an interim order to stay the implementation of transfer order dated 20.11.1990.

2. The representative of the respondents has produced before us a copy of the Office Order No.3(1)SE(E)/WC/88-90/480 dated

...2/-

14.12.90 which reads as follows:

" In continuation of this office previous Order of even No. dated 20.11.90, ^{with a} the transfer Order of Shri Surjeet Kumar Mehta, M/R Driver working under the EE(E), CCW, AIR, Elect. Division No.I, Soochna Bhawan, New Delhi, stands cancelled.

This is issued with the approval of SE(Elect.), CCW, AIR, Soochna Bhawan, New Delhi. "

3. The representative of the respondents stated that the impugned order dated 20.11.90 was issued by mistake and that the same has been corrected by the cancellation order dated 14.12.1990.

4. The learned counsel of the applicant stated that the issue of cancellation order dated 14.12.90, the only further issue which survives in the application relates to the regularisation of the applicant in the post of Driver. The representative of the respondents stated that no person junior to the applicant has so far been regularised and that the regularisation of the Drivers will be taken up separately.

5. After hearing both sides, we, therefore, direct that the case of the applicant for regularisation in the post of Driver be processed by the respondents in accordance with the relevant rules, also taking into account the seniority of the applicant. The application is disposed of at the admission stage itself with the above directions.

There will be no order as to costs.


(D.K.CHAKRAVORTY)
MEMBER(A)


(P.K.KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN