

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI.

AP No. 2728/91 in AP No. 891/92 .. Date of decision: 18.12.92

Sh. Nanga Ram *(Signature)* .. Applicant

Versus

Union of India .. Respondents

Sh. O.N.Moolri .. Counsel for the applicant

Sh. J.P.Varghese .. Counsel for the respondents

CORAM

Hon`ble Sh. P.K. Kartha, Vice Chairman (J)

Hon`ble Sh. B.N.Dhoundiyal, Member (A)

1. Whether the Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? *No*

JUDGEMENT (Oral)

(Delivered by Hon`ble Sh.P.K. Kartha, V.C.(J)

We have heard the learned counsel for both the parties. The learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant has been engaged by the respondents as casual labourer in B.I.Category and he has produced before us a copy of the order issued by the respondents on 09.11.92. The order issued by the respondents has been retained in the record.

(Signature)

(11)

..2..

The letter of appointment states that the appointment will be subject to the order of the Tribunal. Accordingly, we take note of the letter of the respondents dated 09.11.92 and the submission made by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been engaged by the respondents.

The respondents shall continue to engage the applicant in accordance with their letter dated 09.11.92.

B.N.Dhundiya
(B.N.Dhundiya) 18/12/92

Member (A)

signed
18/12/92
(P.K.Kartha)

Vice Chairman (J)