

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA 1013/2004

New Delhi, this the 23rd day of April, 2004

Hon'ble Sh. Sarweshwar Jha, Member (A)

Babli  
W/o Ashok  
R/o L-55, Shakurpur,  
J.J. Colony,  
Delhi.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. N.K.Sahoo)

V E R S U S

1. The Govt of NCT of Delhi,  
Through Chief Secretary,  
G.N.C.T. of Delhi,  
Secretariat, I.G. Stadium,  
New Delhi.
2. The D.D./DDE, (North West-N),  
Directorate of Education,  
FU Block, Pitam Pura,  
Delhi.
3. The Principal,  
Govt. Sarvodaya Bal Vidhalaya,  
Anandvas, Lok Vihar,  
Delhi-110034.
4. Mr. Kachhua (Safai-Karamchari)@ Ramesh  
C/o The Principal,  
Govt. Sarvodaya Bal Vidhalaya,  
Anandvas, Lok Vihar  
Delhi-110034.

...Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Sarweshwar Jha,

Heard.

2. Ld. counsel for the applicant has submitted that, while the applicant had been serving the respondents as a part time sweepress only on meagre salary of Rs.300/- per month since December, 1992, she has been stopped from rendering service to them since September, 2003. However, no formal order has been given to her in this regard. It is also observed that the applicant has represented to the respondents in the matter of increasing her salary and also

*[Handwritten signature]*

regularisation of her services in the past, there has been no response from the respondents in the matter so far. In support of her contention that she deserved to be regularised on the basis of the fact that her performance in the school has been treated as very good by the Vice-Principal, she has made representations to the authorities also in January, 1994, October 1996, July 1997 and in January, 2004. In the meantime, the respondents have approached the Employment Exchange for recruitment to the post of one part time sweeper lying vacant, and stating that the wages would be paid on attendance basis.

3. The applicant has also referred to the decisions of this Tribunal in **Ravinder Kumar & Ors. v. UOI & Ors.** (OA 274/2001 decided by the Lucknow Bench) as reported in 2000 (2) ATJ 93 and also in **S.K.Khosla v. UOI & Ors. v. F.C.I.** [2004 (73) DRJ 425 (DB)] in support of her prayer that she should have been given an opportunity of being heard before her services were terminated by the respondents.

4. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and particularly the fact that a number of representations have been submitted by her to the respondents in the matter to which there has been no response from them so far, I am of the opinion that the ends of justice will be met if this OA is disposed of at this stage itself while hearing on the point of admission with directions to the respondents to consider her representations together with this OA treating the same as a representation and to dispose of the same by issuing a reasoned and speaking order as per



law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. Ld. counsel for the respondents has prayed that she may be allowed interim relief so as to prevent the respondents from passing any written order removing her from service of the respondents.

6. Considering this aspect of the prayer of the applicant, the respondents are directed not to issue any such order during the pendency of the matter with them.

7. With this, OA stands disposed of.



(Sarveshwar Jha)  
Member (A)

/vikas/