

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No.1441 OF 2004

New Delhi, this the 4th day of June, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.S. AGGARWAL, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE SHRI R.K. UPADHYAYA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Mrs. Sneh Lata W/o Sri Jawahar Lal,  
r/o House No.257, Sector 15, Sonapat,  
(Haryaya) presently working as Junior  
Stenographer, Office of the Official  
Liquidator, A2, W2, Curzon Road Barracks,  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi-110001.

....Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri Naresh Kaushik)

Versus

1. Union of India  
through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Industry & Company Affairs,  
5th Floor, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan,  
Dr. Rajendera Prasad Road,  
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Regional Director,  
Company Law Board,  
Kanpur (U.P.).
3. The Official Liquidator,  
attached to High Court of Delhi  
A2, W2, Curzon Road Barracks,  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi-110 001..

.....Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

SHRI JUSTICE V.S. AGGARWAL:-

Earlier the applicant had filed OA 2073/1999.  
It came up before this Tribunal on 27.4.2001 and the  
following order was passed :-

"After hearing Shri Naresh Kaushik,  
learned counsel for some time, he seeks  
permission to withdraw the OA as he submits  
that the facts in this case are covered by  
the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court  
dated 27.8.1999 in Government of India and  
Ors. Vs. Court Liquidator's Employees  
Assn. and Ors. (Civil Appeal No.5642) with  
connected cases. He has submitted that in  
pursuance of the judgement of the Hon'ble  
Supreme Court, similarly situated persons  
like the applicant, for example, S/Shri



Nandan Singh Bisht and Nitish Sharma, who were also company paid employee, have been regularised.

2. In the above circumstances, OA is disposed of as withdrawn with the aforesaid observations. No costs."

2. The Union of India has challenged the said order by filing a Civil Writ Petition No.7049/2003, which was dismissed on 5.11.2003 by the Delhi High Court. Before the decision of the Delhi High Court, the applicant had already made a representation, a copy of which is at Annexure 8, for awarding him the benefit of the decision of the Supreme Court. The same is still pending.

3. It is true that the representation is pending for quite sometime, but necessarily as is apparent from the facts narrated above, the Union of India had already challenged the order passed by the Tribunal between the parties in Delhi High Court in the Writ Petition as referred to above and we re-mention it on the risk of repetition that the same has now been dismissed. In this backdrop, therefore, we direct that the claim of the applicant should be considered in accordance with law by respondent No.3 preferably within three months of the receipt of a certified copy of this order and it should be communicated to the applicant.

4. The present Original Application is disposed of at the admission stage itself.

5. Issue DASTI.



(R.K. UPADHYAYA)  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



(V.S. AGGARWAL)  
CHAIRMAN

/ravi/