

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

...

OA.No.1092 of 1992

New Delhi, this the 1st day of May, 1997.

HON'BLE MR R. K. AHOOJA, MEMBER(A)

1. Babu Ram  
R/o Vill. Nithara Loni Post  
Ghaziabad District  
UTTAR PRADESH.
2. Madan Mohan Sharma  
R/o E-132, Pocket-I  
Mayr Vihar  
NEW DELHI-92.
3. Surender Pal Singh  
R/o H.No.174, Vill. Tekkhand  
Mavi Mohla  
NEW DELHI-20.
4. Om Prakash  
R/o 11/384, Lalita Park  
Laxmi Nagar  
DELHI-92.

... Applicants

By Advocate: Ms Jasmine Ahmed, proxy  
counsel for Shri E. X. Joseph.

versus

1. Union of India, through  
Secretary to the Government  
Ministry of Communications  
Department of Telecommunications  
Sanchar Bhawan  
Ashok Road  
NEW DELHI-110 001.
2. The Chief General Manager  
(Maintenance), Northern Region  
Department of Telecommunications  
Kidwai Bhawan  
NEW DELHI.
3. The Chairman  
Telecom. Commission  
Department of Telecommunications  
Sanchar Bhawan  
Ashok Road  
NEW DELHI-110 001

... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri V. S. R. Krishna.

Contd..2

O R D E R (Oral)

Mr R. K. Ahooja, M(A)

27

The grievance of the applicants who are casual labourers working as Typewriter Technicians is that they have been denied regularisation and they have also not been paid the wages of a skilled labourer. The respondents in the reply explained that there was no post of Typewriter Mechanic and therefore applicants were regularised as unskilled labourers and conferred temporary status with effect from 1.10.89, but they did not accept the same.

2. Today when the matter came up, Shri V. S. R. krishna appearing for the respondents states that since no posts of Typewriter Mechanic were available with the respondents, the respondents have tried to find out adjustment of the applicants and they have since vide orders dated 19.8.94 and 6.1.95 engaged them as Phone Mechanic (copies of the orders taken on record). This is a Class-III category post. The learned proxy counsel for the applicants also states that since the relief has substantially been allowed, the OA can be disposed of finally.

3. In view of the above observation and since the relief has substantially been allowed, this OA is disposed of as infructuous. No order as to costs.

  
(R. K. Ahooja)  
Member(A)