

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench
New Delhi

8

O.A. No. 1417/93

Decided on 19.11.98

Devi Singh Meena Applicant
(By Advocate: Shri R.L.Sethi)

Versus

Union of India Respondents
(By Advocate: Mrs. B. Sunita Rao)

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

HON'BLE DR.A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER(J)

1. To be referred to the Reporter or Not? YES
2. Whether to be circulated to other outlying benches of the Tribunal or not ? No.


(S.R. Adige)
Vice Chairman (A)

(9)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

New Delhi: this the 19th day of November, 1998

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALI, MEMBER (J)

O. A. No. 1417/93

Devi Singh Meena,
S/o Sh. Nanag Meena,
R/o 112/3, Bheara
Enclave, Delhi.

... Applicant.

(By Advocate: Shri Ashish Kalia)

Versus

Union of India
through

1. General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House,
New Delhi-01

2. The Divisional Manager (Railway),
Northern Railway,
Chemsford Road,
New Delhi-01.

3. The Divisional Electric Engineer,
Car Shed,
Ghaziabad.

.... Respondents.

(By Advocate: Smt. B. Sunita Rao)

ORDER

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

Applicant impugns respondents' order dated 24.10.92 (Annexure-A1) and prays for placement at vacancy No. 4 of the 40 point roster with financial relief with effect from the date Shri Karnail Singh (Sl. No. 3) of the panel dated 21.9.90 (Annexure-A2) was appointed.

2. Applicant who belongs to S.T. category was provisionally empanelled at Sl. No. 47 upon the results of a selection held in July-August, 1990 for the post of Electric Khallasi (Rs. 750-940),

subject to verification of character and antecedents vide letter dated 21.9.90 (Annexure-A2). He was medically examined and declared fit vide Memo dated 27.8.91 (Annexure-A3). Not receiving any appointment letter, he represented to respondents on 1.11.91 (Annexure-A5) alleging that persons junior to him had been appointed, while he had been ignored. The letter dated 24.2.92 (Annexure-A4) indicates that all formalities regarding his appointment had been completed but due to non-extension of the panel, appointment letter was not issued to him. By impugned letter dated 24.10.92 (Annexure-A1) applicant was informed that the life of the panel had expired, and a proposal for its extension had referred to Hq Office and upon assent being received applicant's case would be considered.

3. During hearing respondents' counsel was unable to state as to what final decision was taken on the aforesaid proposal, or whether persons junior to applicant in ST category were appointed, after leaving applicant out.

4. This OA is disposed of with a direction to respondents to examine applicant's claim within 2 months of the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and inform him of the factual position in the matter in accordance with rules and instructions, with particular reference to his grievance, that while he was ignored, those junior to him were engaged on the basis of the 21.9.90 panel. No costs.

A. Veda Valli
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
MEMBER(J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).