

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

RA-165/94 in OA-2246/92, RA-171/94 in OA-1601/92
and RA-172/94 in OA-2418/92.

New Delhi this the 9th Day of May, 1994.

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

RA-165/94 in OA-2246/92 RA-171/94 in OA-1601/92 &
RA-172/94 in OA-2418/92.

1. The Secretary,
Ministry of
Aram Shakti
New Delhi.

2. The Chairman,
Central Water Commission,
Sewa Bhavan, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.

3. The Executive Engineer,
Central Stores Divn.,
Central Water Commission,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi.

Review Applicants/
respondents in OA.

(through Sh. Jog Singh)

RA-165/94 in OA-2246/92 versus

Shri Jayant Kumar Pathak,
S/o Sh. Kusheshwar Pathak,
Assistant Electrician,
Central Stores Divn.,
Central Water Commission,
West Block 1, Wing No.4,
2nd Floor, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.

Respondent in RA/
applicant in OA.

RA-171/94 in OA-1601/92

Shri Rajesh Kumar Saini,
S/o Shri Veer Sain Saini,
Workcharged Khalasi,
under Executive Engineer,
Central Stores Division,
Central Water Commission,
West Block No.1, Wing No.4,
2nd Floor, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.

Respondent in RA/
applicant in OA

RA-172/94 in OA-2418/92

1. Shri Rajender Sharma,
S/o Sh. Bhagwan Sharma,
Carpenter, Central Stores Divn.,
Central Water Commission,
West Block No.1, Wing No.4,
2nd Floor, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.

8/

241

2. Sh. Raju Kashyap,
S/o Shri Nikka Ram.
3. Sh. Daya Ram,
S/o Sh. Ganga Ram.
4. Shri Dali Singh,
S/o Sh. Bhup Singh.
5. Shri Giri Raj,
S/o Shri Mishri Singh.
6. Shri Bijendra,
S/o Sh. Teta Ram.
7. Sh. Ram Kumar B.
S/o Sh. Hardev
8. Sh. Uday Kumar,
S/o Shri Kurukul.

Respondents in RA/
Applicants in OA.

(Serial No. 2 to 6 working in Central Stores
Divn., Central Water Commission, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.)

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)
delivered by Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member (A)

These review applications have been filed
by the respondents against the common judgement delivered
on 10.02.94 in O.A. Nos. 223, 884, 1601, 2246 & 2418 of
1992. The following directions were given:-

- (i) the respondents shall prepare a scheme
for retention and regularisation of the
Casual Labourers employed by them. This
scheme should take into account the regular
posts, that can be created, taking into
account the fact that even if a particular
scheme is completed, new schemes are launched
every year. An assessment of the regular
posts that can be created on this basis
should be made. For regularisation, all
those, who have completed 240 days service
in two consecutive years, should be given
priority in accordance with their length
of service;
- (ii) Those, who have complete 120 days of service
should be given temporary status in accord-
ance with the instructions issued by the
department of personnel from time to time.
After completion of the required period of
service, they should be considered for
regularisation;

241

(6)
✓

(iii) Adhoc/temporary employees should not be replaced by other ad hoc/temporary employees and should be retained in preference to their juniors and outsiders;

(iv) Such a scheme shall be submitted by the respondents for scrutiny of this Tribunal within a period of three months from the date of communication of this order by the petitioner to them.

The review applicants claim that though the impugned order is very much legal and has been passed giving consideration to the fact that it would result in retention of junior posts, thus rendering the senior people surplus. It is their contention that due to financial constraint and completion of works in hand W/C staff under different categories from both Central Stores Division as well as Planning Division are likely to be rendered surplus after 31.3.1994. It has also been mentioned that the Ministry of Finance has emphasised surrender of 10% of existing post under W/C Estt. also for declaring 10% post on W/C establishment. They have stated that due to financial constraints and lack of schemes, the applicants were not entitled for any regularisation of their services.

There is nothing in these directions which forces the review applicants to regularise casual workers in the absence of any post. They can take into account the latest position regarding the projects which are continuing and reach the conclusion that no more regular post can be created. The second direction only relates to implementation of the decision of the Deptt. of Personnel regarding temporary status being given to casual workers who have worked for 120 days. Certainly, it cannot be accepted that the applicants will not implement their own orders. The direction No.3 is based on a well

3y

(26)

established principle.

We, therefore, hold that no error apparent on the face of judgement has been brought out in the review applications, which are hereby dismissed. It is reiterated that a scheme prepared in the light of these directions, shall be presented for scrutiny to this Tribunal within the stipulated time.

Let a copy of this order be placed on
three files.

(B.N. DHUNDIYAL)
MEMBER(A)

(S.K. SHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

1/1/1

Original order is
RA 165794 04 2246/92

Attached Two copy

Anteekaia

9.5.94

Co. C17

CAT. P.B.,
New Delhi