

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

16

.....
O.A. No. 2401/91, 1114/92, 1846/92, 2483/92,
3219/92, 3232/92, 64/93, 104/93,
338/93 & 709/93.

New Delhi this the 25th Day of April, 1994.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)
OA-2401/91

Shri Chat Ram,
S/o Shri Punna,
R/o R-Block, Rajender Nagar,
Microwave Project,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.
2. Secretary,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. The General Manager,
Telecommunication Project,
Dept. of Telecom,
New Delhi.
4. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxical Equipment Installation,
Kidwai Bhawan,
New Delhi

Respondents

OA-1114/92

Shri Mohan Lal,
R/o 1661, Babu Park,
Kotla Mubarakpur,
New Delhi-110003.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

84

2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Bulandshahr.

Respondents

OA-1846/92

1. Sh. Jagannath Shukla,
S/o Sh. Ram Milan Shukla,
R/o 561 Maj Pur, Shahdara,
Delhi.

2. Sh. Guru Prasad,
S/o Sh. Ram Khilawan,
B-480, Krishan Nagar,
Delhi.

3. Sh. Kunendarpal Singh,
S/o Sh. Rahubir,
R/o 25, Maj Pur,
Shahdara, Delhi.

4. Sh. Lumbardi,
S/o Sh. Bisram,
R/o 1668, Babu Park,
Kotla Mubarakpur,
New Delhi.

5. Sh. Buddha Ram,
S/o Sh. Badri,
R/o Chuki No. 25,
Sunder Nagar,
New Delhi.

6. Sh. Shasha Ram,
S/o Sh. Badri,
R/o 165, Pradeep Nagar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi.

7. Sh. Munni Lal,
S/o Sh. Ram Badal,
R/o 5135, Main Bazar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi.

Applicants

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.

2. Chief General Manager (Project),
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.

3. Divisional Engineer Telecom,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar,
Jallandhar.

sky

18
4. Divisional Engineer Telecom,
Ambala Cantt.
5. Asstt. Engineer Telecom,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
Ambala Cantt.
Punjab.

Respondents

DA-2483/92

Sh. Daya Shankar,
S/o Sh. Laxmi Narain,
R/o 92, Lakshmi Nagar,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxical Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nagar,
Jallandhar.

Respondents

DA-3219/92

Shri Ved Prakash Sharma,
S/o Shri Dileram,
R/o 1228, Pratap Nagar,
Paharganj,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Phones-II,
Meerut.

Respondents

DA-3232/92

Shri Prem Giri,
S/o Shri Daya Chand,
R/o A-Block, 251, Sarojini Nagar,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra)

versus

Sh.

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Sub Divisional Officer,
Telegraphs,
Meerut.
3. S.D.O. Telegraphs,
Baraut.
4. Accounts Officer,
Telecom Engg. Division,
Saharanpur (UP).

Respondents.

DA-64/93

Sh. Ajay Kumar Singh,
S/o Sh. Vishwanath Singh,
R/o 1/250 K.Puri,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Ms. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
New Delhi.
2. Asstt. Engineer Telecom,
Coaxial Cable Construction,
285, Master Tara Singh Nager,
Jallundhar (Punjab)

Respondents

DA-104/93

Shri Jais Ram,
S/o Shri Sumeshwar,
R/o Raghbir Nager,
B-II 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ Gang,
House No. 478,
New Delhi.

Applicant

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Ms. Rani Chhabra)

versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Dept. of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Assistant Engineer,
Coaxial Cable Construction,
Jallundhar.

Respondents

8/4

DA-338/93

1. Sh. Shri Chand,
S/o Sh. Bhajju Ram,
R/o 128 Moj Pur,
Shahdara.

2. Shri Raja Ram,
S/o Shri Panna Lal,
R/o 16, 258 Barsati,
Lodi Colony,
New Delhi.

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra) Applicants
90

versus

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

2. S.D.P. Phones, Meerut.

3. Assistant Engineer Phones,
Meerut.

4. Divisional Engineer Administration,
Office District Telephone Manager,
Meerut Cantt., Baraut.

5. Sub Divisional Officer Phones I,
X Gar Exchange, Delhi Road, Meerut. Respondents
DA-709/93

1. Kanchan,
S/o Sh. Shiv Avtar,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.

2. Sh. Keshan,
S/o Shri Sunder,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.

3. Sh. Ram Lakhan,
S/o Sh. Mahadev,
R/o 1226, Pratap Nagar,
Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.

(By advocate Ms. Bharti Sharma, proxy counsel for
Mrs. Rani Chhabra) Applicants
84

versus

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

2. Assistant Engineer,
Telecom Project,
A.9.10 Safdarjung Enclave,
New Delhi.

Respondents

ORDER(DR AL)
delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman

In this bunch of the O.As., the facts are similar and the controversy raised is the same. They have been heard together and, therefore, they are being disposed of by a common judgement.

The applicants in these cases allege that from 1986 to 1988 they rendered service to the respondents as casual workers. Their services were terminated in order to give effect to the circular dated 22.4.1987. They have prayed in each of these O.As. that the orders terminating their services may be quashed. They have further prayed that the respondents may be directed to re-engage them in service.

These applications appear to be highly belated. Therefore, they are being dismissed as barred by limitation.

Like any other citizen of this country, each of the applicant is entitled to be considered for a fresh appointment on merits and in accordance with law if he or she is otherwise eligible. We have no doubt that the respondents shall consider their cases if and when they feel the necessity of engaging fresh casual labourers thereby conforming to the mandate of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution.

With these observations, these applications are dismissed.

No costs.

Original order in
(O.A 2401/91)
(B.N. DHUNDIYAL) Attached hereto copy
MEMBER (A) Anil Bhagat
/v/v/ C.C. 25/4/94
CAT. P.A. 25/4/94

(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN