

(5)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 1491/91 New Delhi, dated the 8th June, 1995

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

Shri Roshan Lal,
S/o Shri Jog Raj,
Qr. No. 14, Type II, Press Colony,
Ring Road, Mayapuri,
New Delhi.

(None appeared for the Applicant) APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India,
through the Director of Printing,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Manager,
Govt. of India Press,
Ring Road, Mayapuri,
New Delhi.

(None appeared) RESPONDENTS

ORDER (ORAL)

BY HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

In this application Shri Roshan Lal, Section Holder, Govt. of India Press, Mayapuri, New Delhi had prayed for quashing of the Respondents' order retiring him upon attaining the age of 58 years w.e.f. 30.6.91, and has prayed for a direction to retire him after attaining the age of 60 years on 30.6.1993.

2. Shortly stated, the applicant contends that the job of a Section Holder is manual in character, and being a workman he is entitled to continue in service till he attains the age of 60 years on 30.6.93 in accordance with FR 56-B and corresponding section 459 B of CSR.

3. The Respondents in their reply have contested the O.A. and pointed out that the applicant is a Group 'C' employee and his work

A

is supervisory in nature, and ~~As~~ therefore has no right to continue in service after attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 58 years for supervisory posts. They have submitted that the Categorisation Committee set up by Govt. of India, as well as Recruitment Rules for the post of Section Holder describe the post as ^{A 7}supervisory post.

4. The applicant has reiterated the contents of the O.A. in his rejoinder.

5. None appeared for the applicant when this case was called out and none appeared for the respondents either.

6. Our attention has been invited to the Tribunal judgment dt. 22.4.88 in O.A. 438/86 Roshan Singh Vs. Govt. of India Press wherein the applicant Shri Roshan Singh's plea for identical relief, namely that as Section Holder he was entitled to continue in service till the age of 60 years, was rejected and the O.A. was dismissed on the ground that Section Holders discharge supervisory work. The SLP filed by Shri Roshan Singh against that judgment was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 6.8.90 on merits.

7. In the result this O.A. ^{also} fails and is dismissed. No costs.

A. Veda Valli
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
Member (J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. ADIGE)
Member (A)