

(8)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,
NEW DELHI.

O.A.No.2332 of 1992. Date of Decision: 11.5.93

RishipalApplicant.

Versus

The Director of Audit Central Revenues I
New Delhi, & othersRespondents.

CORAM

H on'ble Mr.Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice-Chairman.

Hon'ble Mr. S.R.Adige, Member(A)

For the applicant: Shri D.S.Jagotra, Counsel.

For the respondents: Shri A.K.Bahera, Counsel.

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

(By Hon'ble Mr.Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice Chairman)

The principal relief claimed is that the respondents may be directed to consider the case of the petitioner for regularisation of his service.

2. A reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents. In the reply, it is averred that the petitioner is not eligible for being considered for regularisation as he has not rendered service for 206 days in two consecutive years. This fact is not controverted in the rejoinder. It is thus clear that the petitioner is not entitled to be considered for regularisation.

3. Learned counsel next urged that, in any view of the matter, this tribunal should direct the respondents to employ the petitioner if and when a need for engaging a casual labourer arises and while doing so, they should give preference to him over his juniors and freshers. We find that there is a direction of this Tribunal in favour of the petitioner given in O.A.No.1889 of 1990 decided on 11.4.91.

We direct the respondents to strictly adhere to the direction given in the aforementioned O.A.

(10)

4. With these directions, this application
is disposed of but without any order as to costs.

Sh. Radige
(S.R. RADIGE)
MEMBER (A)

Sury
(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

(ug)