

-16-

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI**

O.A./XXX. NO. 1838 /19 91 Decided on : 15.12.95.

V. Venkitaraman & others. ... Applicant(s)

( By Shri Madhav Panikar. Advocate )

versus

UOI & Ors. ... Respondent(s)

( By Shri M.K. Gupta. Advocate )

**CORAM**

THE HON'BLE SHRI S.R. Adige, Member(A).

THE HON'BLE ~~SURE~~ Dr. A. Vedavalli, Member(J).

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *Yes*
2. Whether to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? *No*

*M*  
( DR. A. VEDAVALLI )  
MEMBER(J)

*S.R. Adige*  
( S.R. ADIGE )  
MEMBER(A).

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,  
NEW DELHI.

O.A.No.1838/91

New Delhi; December 15<sup>th</sup>, 1995.

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

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

1. Shri V.Venkitaraman
2. J.K.Chakravorty
3. K.R.Nair
4. K.V.Zalpuri
5. Mrs. R.Bhuma.
6. O.P.Bachhety .....Applicant.

By Advocate Shri Madhav Panikar

Versus

1. The Secretary,  
Department of Agriculture & Cooperation,  
Krishi Bhavan,  
New Delhi.
2. The Secretary,  
Department of Personnel & Training,  
Nirvachan Sadan,  
New Delhi .....Respondents.

By Advocate Shri M.K.Gupta

JUDGMENT

By Hon'ble Mr.S.R.Adige, Member(A)


In this application, Shri V.Venkitaraman and others have impugned the seniority list dated 6.6.91 (Annexure-VI) and have sought for a direction to the respondents to issue a new seniority list drawn in accordance with Rule 17(3) CSCS Rules, 1962 and in conformity with the judgment dated 10.7.90 in T.A.No.1066/85 V.Venkitaraman and others Vs. UOI & others. A prayer has also been made to appoint the applicants 1 to 4 as Assistants on long term basis in term of O.M. dated 29.12.83; deinduct non-eligible UDCs from the select list

of UDC/Asstt. for the years 1978-91; induct the eligible petitioners in the select list of Assistant grade for the year 1988-89; re-promote the petitioners 5 and 6 who were reverted during the pendency of the writ petition; issue a general direction by Respondent 2 to all cadre authorities participating with the CSCS to de-induct the UDCs who had been inducted in the select list vide O.M dated 26.5.84; de-induct the promotees from the common seniority list and to initiate the Contempt of Court proceedings against the non-implementation of judgment dated 10.7.90.

2. During the course of hearing, counsel for both parties agreed that the seniority list dated 6.6.91 is only a provisional one, to which objections have been invited, which still remain to be disposed of. Under the circumstances the OA which impugns a seniority list, which is merely provisional, is clearly premature.

3. Both parties agree that this OA may be disposed of with a direction to the respondents to finalise the seniority list of UDCs, in accordance with law, after disposing of the objections to the said list, as expeditiously as possible and preferably within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. The applicants would be entitled to the consequential benefits <sup>flowing</sup> from the operation of the seniority list, so finalised, in accordance with the rules and instructions on the subject.

4. This OA is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

  
( DR.A. VEDAVALLI )  
MEMBER(J)

  
( S. R. ADIGE )  
MEMBER(A)