

13
①

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

CCP NO. 389/93 in OA NO. 2672/92

New Delhi this the 30th day of November, 1993

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN
THE HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

Ram Khilari S/O Shri Gilli Ram,
R/O 101, Railway Colony,
Maharajpur, Gwalior-274020,
Working as Monthly Rated Casual
Labour Helper Pump Operator,
at the Director, IRCAMTACH,
Maharajpur, Gwalior. Petitioner

By Advocate Shri H. P. Chakravorty

Versus

1. Shri K. R. Vij,
General Manager,
Central Railway,
Bombay VT.
2. Shri V. K. Aggarwal,
Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway,
Jhansi.
3. Shri Brijendra Singh Kushwaha,
Director, Indian Railway
Centre for Advanced Maintenance
Technology (IRCAMTECH),
Maharajpur, Gwalior-274020
now DRM Sonpur.
4. Shri Joshphilip,
Director, Indian Railway Centre
for Advanced Maintenance
Technology (IRCAMTECH),
Maharajpur, Gwalior, Respondents

By Advocate Shri H. K. Gangwani

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. S. Malimath :-

The complaint in this case is that the directions issued in O.A.2672/92 dated 16.3.1993 have been violated. Reading the judgment as a whole along with the directions, we find that the petitioner, when he approached the Tribunal, was employed as a casual labourer under respondent No.3 and he continued in

that post by virtue of the interim order. The ultimate directions are to respondent No.3 that the petitioner should be continued as a casual labourer as long as respondent No.3 needs his services, in preference to outsiders or any person junior to him. The respondents have taken the stand in their reply that the sanction for the post in which the petitioner was employed has since come to an end requiring the termination of the petitioner's service. They have also asserted that with respondent No.3 there is no other outsiders or juniors who have been continued as casual labourers. There is no good reason to disbelieve this statement. That in the Jhansi Division there were some persons junior to the petitioner who were continued is not relevant for the purpose of this case as the continuation of the petitioner as casual labourer was directed only with respondent No.3 meaning thereby in preference to outsiders and juniors so far as that unit is concerned. We are, therefore, satisfied that there is no violation of the ~~subsequent~~ order of the Tribunal calling for further action under the Contempt of Courts Act. These proceedings are accordingly dropped.

Adige
(S. R. Adige)
Member (A)

B. Malimath
(V. S. Malimath)
Chairman

/as/