

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

OA No. 133/91

DATE OF DECISION 24.9.91.

Smt. Laj Rani Talwar	-	Applicant.
Shri D.P. Avinashi	-	Advocate for the applicant.
Verses		
Union of India & Others	-	Respondents.
Shri P.P. Khurana,	-	Advocate for the respondent(s) No. 1-4.
Shri Shyam Babu,	-	Advocate for the respondent(s) No. 5 & 6.

CORAM

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

The Hon'ble Mr. B.N. DHOUNDIYAL, MEMBER(A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

(JUDGEMENT)

(JUDGEMENT OF THE BENCH DELIVERED HON'BLE MEMBER(A)
SHRI B.N. DHOUNDIYAL)

The applicant, Smt. Laj Rani Talwar, had been serving with the Overseas Communication Service of the Government of India and after the formation of Videsh Sanchar Nigam, she was absorbed in that organisation as UDC on 02.07.1990. She had been allotted Government accommodation from general pool bearing No.E-99, Sarojini Nagar, New Delhi. Under memorandum issued by Directorate of Estates on 24.10.1985, the transferred employees were allowed to retain the accommodation. It is understood that Videsh Sanchar Nigam has plans for construction of Staff quarters and have sought time till 1992 from the Directorate of Estates for continuation of occupation of general pool accommodation by the transferred employees. However, the applicant

6
has received cancellation order dated 15.10.1990 from the Directorate of Estates and initiation of eviction proceedings has also been mentioned. The applicant has prayed that the impugned order be quashed.

2. An interim order directing the respondents not to dispossess the applicant from the accommodation E-99, Sarojini Nagar, New Delhi subject to payment of licence fee was passed on 18.1.91 and the same has been extended from time to time till this date.

3. It has been held in OA-74/91 by another Bench of the Tribunal on 30.2.91 in a similar application which was also against Videsh Sanchar Nigam Ltd., that the said body is a Public Sector Company and that as no notification has been issued under Section 14(2) of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985, ^{BN} this Tribunal will have ^W jurisdiction over it. We reiterate the same view.

4. In view of this, we find that the present application is not maintainable and, therefore, it is dismissed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

5. Interim order passed on 18.1.91 stands vacated.

B. N. Dhoundiyal
(B.N. DHOUNDIYAL)
Member(A)

24/9/91

P. K. Kartha
(P.K. KARTHA)
Vice-Chairman(J)