

(7)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

DA-316/93
DA-318/93
DA-437/93
DA-439/93
DA-470/93
DA-1303/92

Thursday, this the 28th day of November, 1996.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHETTUR SANKARAN NAIR, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. S.P. BISWAS, MEMBER (A)

DA-316/93

Sube Singh,
S/o Sh. Ratti Ram,
R/o Village Zindhpur,
P.C. Mukhnilpur,
Delhi-110036.Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Delhi Administration through
Chief Secretary, 5 Alipur Road, Delhi.Respondents
2. Development Commissioner, Delhi Administration, 5/9 Underhill Road, Delhi.Respondents

(None for Respondents)

DA-318/93

Name Ram, S/o Ram Chander, R/o Village Hiranki Kushak, P.O. Khas, Alipur Delhi.Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

Delhi Administration through
Chief Secretary, 5 Alipur Road, Delhi.

2. Development Commissioner, Delhi Administration, 5/9 Underhill Road, Delhi.Respondents

(None for Respondents)

DA-437/93

Tula Ram, S/o Sh. Mohar Singh, R/o H.No.621, Alipur, Delhi.Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Delhi Administration, through Chief Secretary, 5, Alipur Road, Delhi.

(3)

-2-

2. The Development Commissioner,
Delhi Administration,
5/9 Under Hill Road, Delhi. ... Respondents

(None for respondents)

DA-439/93

Bhane Ram, S/o Sh. Khilali,
R/o Village Mohdpur, Ramjanpur,
P.O. Alipur, Delhi. ... Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Delhi Administration through
Chief Secretary, 5, Alipur Road,
Delhi.
2. The Development Commissioner,
Delhi Administration, 5/9 Under Hill Road, ... Respondents

(None for Respondents)

DA-470/93

Nanu Ram, S/o Puran,
R/o Village Zindapur, P.O. Mukmilpur,
Delhi. ... Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Delhi Administration through
Chief Secretary, 5, Alipur Road,
Delhi.
2. Development Commissioner,
Delhi Administration, 5/9 Under Hill Road, ... Respondents

(None for Respondents)

DA-1303/92

Mahavir, S/o Sh. Kishan Lal,
R/o Village Basi,
P.O. Khekra, ... Applicant

Distt. Meerut (U.P.) (By Advocate Sh. Ashok Aggarwal)

Versus

1. Delhi Administration through
Chief Secretary, 5, Alipur Road,
Delhi.
2. Development Commissioner,
Delhi Administration, 5/9 Under Hill Road, ... Respondents

(None for respondents)

These applications having been heard on 28.11.1996
the Tribunal on the same day passed the following:

ORDER

Chettur Sankaran Nair (J), Chairman

Applicants who are casual labourers were denied employment on the ground that they suffered from Tuberculosis. According to them they are not afflicted with this disease. Whether they are Tubercular patients or not is not a matter which should appropriately be subject matter of judicial review. Respondents will call applicants to be examined by a duly constituted Medical Board to ascertain their physical state. If they are found to be healthy and not suffering from Tuberculosis the order of termination to the extent it is based on medical grounds will stand quashed. Those of the applicants who are continuing in service by reason of interim orders will be retained until the Medical Board takes a decision in the matter. Applicants will produce a copy of this order before respondents who shall acknowledge the same. The acknowledgement will be lodged in the Registry. Medical Board will be constituted and applicants will be examined by the said Board within six weeks of the date of acknowledgement of this order by respondents.

2. Application is disposed of as aforesaid.

Dated, this the 28th day of November, 1996.

(S.P. BISWAS) (CHETTUR SANKARAN NAIR, J.)
Member (A) Chairman

'Sanju'

PRITAM SINGH
Court Officer
Central Administrative Tribunal
Prashant Bhawan, Principal Bench
1, Lajpat Singhania Road, Dilkusha Kothi, New Delhi

Done copy
Attest
Pritam
28/11