

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

OA-2195/93

New Delhi this the 10th Day of June, 1994.

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

Shri Rajender Singh,
S/o Shri Uday Singh,
R/o Qr.No.1335, Sector-V,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-22.

Applicant

(By advocate Sh. T.C. Aggarwal)

versus

1. Union of India,
through the Director
General, Doordarshan,
Mandi House, New Delhi.

2. Director, Central Production
Centre Doordarshan,
Asiad Village,
New Delhi-49.

Respondents

(By advocate Sh. K.S. Lobana, proxy counsel for
Sh. K.C. Sharma)

ORDER (ORAL)

delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, V.C.

The prayers in this O.A. are these:-

(i) Direction be given to the respondents
to reinstate the applicant in service
and give temporary status;

(ii) Applicant be kept on live casual labour
register for regularisation;

A counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf
of the respondents. The learned counsel for the parties
have been heard.

The matter pertains to the Doordarshan,
therefore, this case has to be examined in the light

SM

of the office memorandum dated 10.09.1993 whereby a scheme for the grant of temporary status and regularisation of casual labourers has been enforced with effect from 10.09.1993.

For the purpose of grant of temporary status, the primary requirement is that a casual worker must have put in either 240 days continuous service in one year or 206 days in administrative offices observing 5 days week, as the case may be.

In the counter-affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, it is asserted that the applicant did not render a continuous service of 240 days in one year to the Respondent No.2. The argument is that the counter-affidavit is silent with respect to the Respondent No.1.

In paragraph 4.2 of the O.A., it is the applicant's own case that he worked as a casual worker with the Respondent No.1 in different spells from 1.1.1988 to 31.3.1988 and from 24.4.1990 to 15.9.1990. Taking the case of the applicant on its face, the position is clear that he failed to render continuous service of 240 days in one year to the Respondent No.1. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible that the applicant is not entitled to the grant of temporary status under the scheme afore mentioned. We have already analysed the prayers made in this O.A. In view of our observations above, the applicant is not entitled to any relief from this Tribunal at this stage.

The learned counsel has urged that the applicant is at present working with the respondents. The applicant apprehends that his services may be terminated illegally. We have no doubt that the respondents will act strictly in accordance with law while dealing

with the case of the applicant.

With these observations, this application
is dismissed. No costs.


(B. N. DHOUNDIYAL)
MEMBER (A)


(S. K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

/vv/