CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.3079/2004
MA 2588/2004

New Delhi this the 24th day of December, 2004

Hon'ble Mrs. Meera Chhibber, Member (J)

1. Mange Ram S/0 Sh.Braham Singh
2. Dharam Das S/0 Sh.Sawat Ram Singh
3. Subhash Chand S/o Sh Kalu Ram
4. Suresh Pal S/0 Shri Ganga Ram
5. Dharamveer Singh Saini S/0 Sh.Dalel Singh
6. Ram Gopal S/0 Braham Singh
7. Sher Singh S/0 Sh.Bharmal
8. Praveen S/0 Sh.Balke Lal
9. Rajpal Singh S/0 Sh.Shyam Singh
10. Ms.Usha D/0 Sh.Charan Singh
11. Ms.Sakuntla D/0 Sh.Charan Singh

Applicants

(All the applicants have been serving with the respondent No.3 as casual labourers and all are the R/0 Vill.Pabarsa PO Daurala, Meerut (UP)

(By Advocate U.Srivastava)

VERSUS

Union of India through

1. The Secretary,
   Indian Counsel for Agricultural Research,
   through its Secretary,
   Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Project Director,
   Project Directorate of Cropping System
   Research, Modi Puram, Meerut UP.

3. The Farm Superintendent,
O/0 the Poject Director,
Project Directorate of Cropping System Research,
Modi Puram, Meerut,UP.

Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Mrs. Meera Chhibber, Member (J)

This OA has been filed by as many as eleven applicants who have prayed for a direction to the respondents to at least consider their cases for regularization in service in accordance with the Casual Labour Scheme. It is submitted by the applicants that they were engaged by the respondents as casual labourers on muster Roll in 1991 and 1993. On 5.8.1997, the respondents issued an order granting temporary status to the similarly situated persons w.e.f. 1.9.1993 but their cases were ignored. It is submitted that they were disengaged from their services in 2002 and thereafter the respondents engaged the casual labourers only through contractors. It is submitted by the applicants that they have served the respondents with intermittent and usual breaks and they served the respondents even through the contractors to the entire satisfaction of their superiors.

2. Their grievance now is, that in March, 2004, an advertisement was put up on the notice board whereby the respondents had asked for engagement of casual labourers on muster roll. Applicants applied and some of the applicants were engaged by the respondents on muster roll but thereafter respondents have not even considered the applicants in June, 2004 even though they are engaging the other casual labourers.

3. It is submitted by the applicants that they have given the representations also to the Director General through the Regd.post on 5.2.2004 but no reply has been given to them so far . It is submitted by the applicants that the respondents are changing casual labourers so that they do not have to regularise persons like the applicants who had worked with them for a longer time. It is submitted by the counsel for the applicants that none of the representations has been decided by the respondents.

4. Since the grievance of the applicants is that they have worked longer with the respondents and their representations have not even been considered by the respondents, think that this OA can be disposed of at the admission stage itself without going into the merits of the case by giving direction to the respondents to consider this OA itself as a representation along with the representations which are annexed at pages 21 to 23 of the paper book and to decide the same by a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, under intimation to the applicants.

(Mrs.Meera Chhibber)
Member (J)

sk