

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A.No.1667/92

CA

Ved Pal Dalal & Ors. .. Applicants

Vs.

U.U.I. .. Respondents

Present: Shri Shankar Raju for the Applicant and
None for the Respondents

The applicants in this case have challenged their reversion by the impugned order dated 19.6.1992 from Delhi Police to their parent department in CRPF. They have been on deputation from 18.9.88 and their contention is that while others have been absorbed, the Respondents i.e. the Delhi Police Authority have not even initiated any action to ^{get the} consent their parent department for their absorption in Delhi Police. Having listened to the ld. counsel for the applicants, we feel convinced that the ^{application has} ~~applications have~~ ^{no} force and ~~have~~ to be rejected. It is an established law that the deputationists have no right to remain permanently or on extended deputation irrespective of the consent of the borrowing department or the lending department. Whether the deputationists should be allowed to continue on deputation or to be absorbed is an administrative manner, which is decided by the borrowing department. This Tribunal cannot question the administrative discretion in such matters. In the circumstances, we see no force in the demand of the applicants and we ~~dismiss~~ dismiss this without any order as to costs. However, we ^{may} make it clear that since the applicants continue to remain with the Delhi Police by virtue of the interim order passed by the Tribunal on ~~27.1.92~~ 2.7.1992, the period of their continuance with the Delhi Police after 18.6.1992 till they are relieved will be considered to be an extended deputation for the applicants.

(C.J. Roy)
Member (J)
10.2.1993

(S.P. Mukerji)
Vice Chairman
10.2.1993