

(2) (5)
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No.2724/93.

NEW DELHI, THIS THE 14th DAY OF JULY, 1999.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.M. AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)

1. Shri R.P.Ram
in Representative capacity
as General Secretary,
The Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes
Principals/Vice Principals'
Welfare Association, Delhi (Regd.)
B-462, Paschim Vihar,
NEW DELHI.

2. Shri M.P. Singh,
Principal,
Govt. Boys Senior Secondary School
No.2, Moti Nagar, New Delhi.

....APPLICANTS

(None for the applicants)

vs.

1. Lt. Governor of National Capital territory of
Delhi, Raj Niwas, Delhi.
2. Chief Secretary,
National Capital Territory of Delhi,
Old Sectt., Delhi.
3. Secretary (Education Department)
National Capital Territory of Delhi,
Old Sectt., Delhi.
4. Union Public Service Commission,
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi.

.....RESPONDENTS

(None for the respondents)

ORDER

JUSTICE K.M. AGARWAL:

This O.A. in representative capacity has been filed for giving seniority to the Principals belonging to Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes communities after giving them regularisation in the post of Principals from the dates of their initial ad hoc appointments.

2. Applicant No.1 claims himself to be the General Secretary of "The Scheduled Castes/ Scheduled Tribes Principals/ Vice Principals Welfare Association, Delhi" and to have been authorised by the association in its Emergency

Meeting held on 28.3.93 to file the said application. Applicant No.2 is shown to be the Principal of Govt. Boys Sr. Secondary School, Moti Nagar, New Delhi, who does not appear to be an affected person. This application, therefore, does not appear to be in conformity with Rule 4 (5) (b) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, which is as follows:


"(b) Such permission may also be granted to an association representing the persons desirous of joining in single application provided, however, that the application shall disclose the class/grade/categories of persons on whose behalf it has been filed provided that at least one affected person joins such an application."

3. A counter has been filed on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant and perusing the record, we find that the application being not in conformity with Rule 4 (5) (b) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, it is liable to be dismissed. Apart from this, we also find no case on merits. It appears from the reply filed on behalf of respondents 1 to 3 that regular appointments of Principals were made in accordance with the recruitment rules. All S.C./S.T. candidates within the zone of consideration were considered as per various instructions of the Government of India issued from time to time and upheld by the Supreme Court in SLP No.IA No.3-4 in C.A. No.1194/92. Persons given additional charge to look after the work of Principals, cannot claim their such assignment or appointment to be regular appointment to the post of Principals. For these reasons this O.A. deserves to be dismissed.

4. In the result this O.A. fails and it is hereby dismissed, but without any order as to costs.


(K.M. AGARWAL)
CHAIRMAN


(N. SAHU)
MEMBER (A)