

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 2450 of 1991

This 11th day of April, 1994

Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman (3)

Hon'ble Mr. B.K. Singh, Member (A)

Amit Kumar Tewari,  
C/o A.K. Tewari,  
Jr. Telecom Officer,  
Mawana Telephone Exchange,  
Mawana (Meerut)

.....

Applicant

By Advocate: Mrs. Rani Chhabra

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Communications,  
Department of Telecommunication,  
New Delhi.
2. The Secretary,  
Department of Telecommunication,  
Sanchar Bhavan,  
New Delhi.
3. The General Manager,  
Telecommunication Project,  
Department of Telecom,  
New Delhi.
4. The Divisional Engineer,  
Mission Compound,  
Saharanpur (UP)
5. The Assistant Engineer (Phones)  
Unit-II,  
Mission Compound,  
Saharanpur (UP)

By Advocate: None present.

Contd.....2/-

*Singh*

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaen, VC(J)

.....

The principal prayer in this O.A. is that the order dated 10.9.87~~7~~ passed by the respondents, whereby the services of the applicant were terminated w.e.f. 10.10.1987, be quashed.


2. The material averments in this OA are these. The applicant was recruited as a casual labourer in the Department of Telecommunication in October 1985. He worked there from October 1985 to July 1987. The respondent No.5 (Assistant Engineer, Phones) issued a letter dated 10.9.87 whereby the applicant was informed that his services were being terminated w.e.f. the said date on account of non-availability of work.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed by the respondents. Therein, the material averments are these. The casual workers are kept on daily wages in order to complete the specific job and a clear understanding was given to the applicant that immediately after the completion of the job, his services shall also come to an end. On the completion of the job the applicant was informed on 10.9.87 that he will not be on the muster roll w.e.f. 10.10.87 as the job for which he was engaged, was going to be completed from the said date. It is wrong to suggest that the applicant was denied work on account of certain policy decision.

Contd.....3/

12

4. On the face of it, the application appears to be highly belated. No satisfactory explanation has been offered as to why this application was not filed within time in this Tribunal. The interim order passed on 20.10.1991 automatically stands vacated.

  
(B.K. SINGH)  
MEMBER (A)

  
(S.K. DHAON)  
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

vpc