Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

.....

O.As No. 2401/91, 1114/92, 1846/92, 2483/92,
3219/92, 3232/92, 64/93, 104/93,
338/93 & 709/93.

New Delhi this the 25th Day of April, 1994.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)

OA-2401/91

Shri Chet Ram,
S/o Shri Punna,
R/o R-Block, Rajender Nagar,
Microwave Project,
New Delhi. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

2. Secretary,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

3. The General Manager,
Telecommunication Project,
Deptt. of Telecom,
New Delhi.

4. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxical Equipment Installation,
Kidwai Bhawan,
New Delhi Respondents

OA-1114/92

Shri Mohan Lal,
R/o 1661, Babu Park,
Kotla Mubarakpur,
New Delhi-110003. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

(15)

2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Bulandshahr. Respondents

OA-1846/92

1. Sh. Jagannath Shukla,
S/o Sh. Ram Milan Shukla,
R/o 561 Moj Pur, Shahdra,
Delhi.

2. Sh. Guru Prasad,
S/o Sh. Ram Khilawan,
B-480, Krishan Nagar,
Delhi.

3. Sh. Kunenderpal Singh,
S/o Sh. Rahubir,
R/o 25, Moj Pur,
Shahdhra, Delhi.

4. Sh. Lumbari,
S/o Sh. Bisram,
R/o 1668, Babu Park,
Kotlamubarakpur,
New Delhi.

5. Sh. Buddha Ram,
S/o Sh. Badri,
R/o Chuki No. 25,
Sunder Nagar,
New Delhi.

6. Sh. Shasha Ram,
S/o Sh. Badri,
R/o 165, Pradeep Nagar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi.

7. Sh. Munni Lal,
S/o Sh. Ram Badal,
R/o 5135, Main Bazar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi. Applicants

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

2. Chief General Manager(Project),
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

3. Divisional Engineer Telecom,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar,
Jallandhar.

(16)

4. Divisional Engineer Telecom,
Ambala Cantt.

5. Asstt. Engineer Telecom,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
Ambala Cantt.
Punjab. Respondents

OA-2483/92

Sh. Daya Shankar,
S/o Sh. Laxmi Narain,
R/o 92, Lakshmi Nagar,
New Delhi. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar,
Jallandhar. Respondents

OA-3219/92

Shri Ved Prakash Sharma,
S/o Shri Dileram,
R/o 1228, Pratap Nagar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Phones-II,
Meerut. Respondents

OA-3232/92

Shri Prem Giri,
S/o Shri Daya Chand,
R/o A-Block, 251, Sarojini Nagar,
New Delhi. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

(17)

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Meerut.

3. S.D.O. Telegraphs,
Baraut.

4. Accounts Officer,
Telecom Eng.Division,
Saharanpur(UP). Respondents.

OA-64/93

Sh. Ajay Kumar Singh,
S/o Sh. Vishwanath Singh,
R/o 1/250 K.Puri,
New Delhi. Apolicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

2. Asstt.Engineer Telecom,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar,
Jallundhar(Punjab) Respondents

OA-104/93

Shri Jais Ram,
S/o Shri Sumeshar,
R/o Raghubir Nagar,
B-III 12½ Gang,
House No.478,
New Delhi. Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
Jallundhar. Respondents

18

OA-338/93

1. Sh. Shri Chand,
S/o Sh. Bhajju Ram,
R/o 128 Moj Pur,
Shahdhara.

2. Shri Raja Ram,
S/o Shri Panna Lal,
R/o 16,258 Barsati,
Lodi Colony,
New Delhi. Applicants

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Department of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. S.D.P. Phones, Meerut.

3. Assistant Engineer Phones,
Meerut.

4. Divisional Engineer Administration,
Office District Telephone Manager,
Meerut Cantt., Baraut.

5. Sub Divisional Officer Phones I,
X Bar Exchange, Delhi Road, Meerut. Respondents

OA-709/93

1. Kanchan,
S/o Sh. Shiv Avtar,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.

2. Sh. Keshan,
S/o Shri Sunder,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.

3. Sh. Ram Lakhan,
S/o Sh. Mahadev,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi. Applicants

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Deptt. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delh.

(19)

2. Assistant Engineer,
Telecom Project,
A.B.10 Safdarjung Enclave,
New Delhi.

Respondents

ORDER(ORAL)
delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman

In this bunch of the O.As., the facts are similar and the controversy raised is the same. They have been heard together and, therefore, they are being disposed of by a common judgement.

The applicants in these cases allege that from 1986 to 1988 they rendered service to the respondents as casual workers. Their services were terminated in order to give effect to the circular dated 22.4.1987. They have prayed in each of these O.As. that the orders terminating their services may be quashed. They have further prayed that the respondents may be directed to re-engage them in service.

These applications appear to be highly belated. Therefore, they are being dismissed as barred by limitation.

Like any other citizen of this country, each of the applicants is entitled to be considered for a fresh appointment on merits and in accordance with law if he or she is otherwise eligible. We have no doubt that the respondents shall consider their cases if and when they feel the necessity of engaging fresh casual labourers thereby conforming to the mandate of Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution.

With these observations, these applications are dismissed.

No costs.

(B.N. DHOUNDIYAL)
MEMBER(A)

(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

/vv/