

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

...

OA.No.1321 of 1992

(11)

Dated New Delhi, this 20th day of February, 1997.

HON'BLE MR K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER(A)

Anand Kumar
R/o 28/18, Kasturba Nagar
Shahdara
DELHI-110032. ... Applicant
By Advocate: Ms Jasmine Ahmed, proxy
counsel for Shri E. X. Joseph

versus

1. Union of India, through
Secretary
Ministry of Finance
Department of Revenue
North Block, Central Secretariat
NEW DELHI-1.
2. Deputy Director(Administration)
Directorate General of Inspection
Customs and Excise
5th Floor
D-Block
I. P. Estate
NEW DELHI-110002. ... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri V. S. R. Krishna

O R D E R (Oral)

Mr K. Muthukumar, M(A)

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties. The short question involved in this application is that, the applicant claims to have worked for more than 206 days with the respondents for a consecutive period of two years. The learned counsel for the applicant has given details of such employment from May 1990 to May 1991 and, May 1991 to January 1992 (Annexures pages 15 to 21). From the details it is seen that the applicant has

Contd..2

(12)

completed 237 days between May 1990 and May 1991 and again 237 days between May 1991 and January 1992. In view of this averment, *prima-facie*, it appears that the applicant is eligible for reengagement and regularisation in his turn.

Therefore, the application is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the period of employment of the applicant, which is not specifically denied by the respondents in the counter reply, and to consider him for reengagement and regularisation in his turn according to the rules and orders in force. There shall be no order as to costs.


(K. Muthukumar)
Member(A)

dbc