

(8)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

O.A.No.2722 of 1992, O.A.No.2763 of 1992,
O.A.No.3196 of 1992 and O.A.No.172 of 1993.

Dated New Delhi, the 11th day of April, 1994

Hon'ble Mr Justice S. K. Dhawan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Mr B. K. Singh, Member (A)

O.A.No.2722 of 1992

Shri Munesh Kumar
S/o Shri Chete Singh
R/o A-128 Sarojini Nagar
NEW DELHI

... Applicant

By Advocate: Mrs Rani Chhabra

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through its Secretary
Ministry of Communication
Department of Telecommunication
Sanchar Bhawan
NEW DELHI

2. Sub Divisional Officer
Telegraphs
DEHRADUN

... Respondents

By Advocate: None present

O.A.No.2763 of 1992

1. Shri Ramesh Singh Panwar
S/o Shri Chandra Singh
R/o 1228, Pratap Nagar
Paharganj
NEW DELHI

2. Shri Amar Singh
S/o Shri Shiv Mohan
R/o 251 Majpur
Shahdara
NEW DELHI

3. Shri Balwant Singh
S/o Shri Dulare
R/o 251, Majpur, Shahdara
NEW DELHI

4. Shri Maiku Lal
S/o Bhullu
R/o 251, Majpur, Shahdara
NEW DELHI

... Applicants

By Advocate: Mrs Rani Chhabra

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through Secretary
Ministry of Communication
Department of Telecommunication
Sanchar Bhawan
NEW DELHI

Contd...2

9

2. Sub Divisional Officer Telegraphs
Gopeshwar, Chamoli,
Garhwal (U.P.)

3. Divisional Engineer Telegraphs
Srinagar
Garhwal (U.P.)

4. Assistant Engineer
Coaxical Cable Project
Telephones
Raorki

5. Divisional Engineer Telecom
Coaxical Cable Project
New Delhi

... Respondents

By Advocate: None present

O.A.No.3196 of 1992

Shri Virendra Singh
S/o Lallu Singh
R/o Block No.18
House No.:386 Barsarathi
Lodhi Colony
NEW DELHI

... Applicant

By Advocate: Mrs. Rani Chhabra

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through its Secretary
Ministry of Communication
Department of Telecommunication
Sanchar Bhawan
New Delhi

2. Assistant Engineer Telecom
Coaxical Cable Construction
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar
Jalandhar

... Respondents

By Advocate: None present

O.A. No.172 of 1993

Shri Laxman Singh Rana
S/o Shri Mahendra Singh Rana
R/o Raghbir Nagar
8-III 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ Gang, House No.478
New Delhi

... Applicant

By Advocate: Mrs. Rani Chhabra

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through its Secretary
Ministry of Communication
Department of Telecommunication
Sanchar Bhawan
New Delhi

2. Divisional Engineer Telephones
Dehradun

3. Sub Division Officer
Phones
Dehradun

... Respondents

By Advocate: None present

ORDER (Oral)

(Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, VC(J))

1) The prayers made in these applications are similar. These have been heard together and, are being disposed of by a common judgment.

2. In each of these cases the principal prayer is that orders of the respondents, either written or oral, terminating the services of the applicants, being illegal, therefore the same may be quashed. Further prayer made is that the respondents may be directed to take the applicants back to work.

3. In O.A. 2722/92, the applicant alleges that he worked with the respondents from November 1986 to July 1987. The applicant in OA 3196/92 claims that he rendered services with the respondents between July 1987 and October 1988. The allegation in OA 2763/92 is that the applicant No.1 rendered service with the respondents regularly from Nov. 1978 to September 1981, October 1982 to June 1983 and November 1983 to June 1984. The applicants 2 and 3 were recruited in January 1981 and June 1981 respectively. The applicant No.4 in this OA worked with the respondents from August 1978 till January 1981. In OA 172/93 the allegation is that the applicant was employed as casual worker with the respondents from June 1985 till July 1987.

4. We have considered all these applications carefully and we find that all of them are liable to be rejected on the ground of limitation. No satisfactory explanation has been offered by the applicants in either of these applications for the inordinate delay in

Contd....4/-

(11)

approaching this Tribunal.

5. However, like any citizen of this country, the applicants have a right to be considered for fresh employment, if and when the respondents take steps to recruit fresh casual labourers, if otherwise the applicants are eligible.

6. With these observations these applications are dismissed, but without any order as to costs.

The interim orders passed on 22.10.92 in OA 2722/92, 9.12.92 in OA No. 3196/92 and 22.1.93 in O.M. No. 172/93, automatically stand vacated.

(B.K. Singh)
Member (A)

(S.K. Dhaon)
Vice Chairman (J)

vpc