

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

REGN. NO. CCP 4/92 in
OA 39/91

DATE OF DECISION: 25.3.1992

Anil Kumar Butalia & anr. Petitioners.

Versus

Union of India. ... Respondent.

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.
THE HON'BLE MR. P.C. JAIN, MEMBER(A).

For the Petitioners. ... Shri O.P. Gupta,
Counsel.

For the Respondent. ... Shri M.L. Verma,
Counsel.

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Malimath,
Chairman)

The grievance of the petitioners in this case is that they have not been engaged as Lighting Assistant. The direction of the Tribunal is that the petitioners should be engaged if the vacancies exist in preference to juniors and outsiders. In reply filed by the respondent, there is a positive statement to the effect that ^{at present} there is no post of Lighting Assistant against which the petitioners could be accommodated. They have also clarified that the respondents are not engaging Lighting Assistant. There is no good reason to disbelieve the statement of the respondent. If there are no vacancies, the question of engaging the petitioners does not arise. Hence, we see no good grounds in the contempt petition. The rule is accordingly discharged.

P.C. Jain
(P.C. JAIN)
MEMBER(A)

V.S. Malimath
(V.S. MALIMATH)
CHAIRMAN