

9

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

New Delhi this the 21st Day of January 1997.

Hon'ble Shri A.V. Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Shri R.K. Ahooja, Member (A)

O.A. No. 2422/92

Shri Rajesh Kumar
Son of Shri Badri Nath
Ex. Mobile Booking Clerk
North Eastern Railway
Railway Station
Kasganj

O.A. No. 1960/92

Shri Ajay Kumar Shukla
Son of Shri C.S. Shukla
Ex-Mobile Booking Clerk
Railway Station, N.E. Railway,
Karnauj.

O.A. No. 77/1993

Shri Surinder Singh Rathore
Son of Shri Babu Singh Rathore
Ex. Additional Booking Clerk
Railway Station,
North Eastern Railway
Patahgarh Railway Station.

O.A. No. 76/1993

Shri Rajinder Kumar Mishra
Son of Shri Durga Prasad Mishra
Ex. Volunteer/Mobile Ticket Collector
Under Station Superintendent
North Eastern Railway
Pilibhit.

O.A. No. 465/1993

Shri R.S. Kashyap
Son of Shri Dharam Das Kashyap
ex. Mobile Booking Clerk
Railway Station
Budayun.

O.A. No. 1053/1992

Shri Shiv Kumar
son of Shri Thakur Das
Ex. Additional Booking Clerk
North Eastern Railway
Puranpur.

O.A. No. 904/1992

Shri Narayan Singh

Son of Shri Mohendra Singh
ex. Additional Booking Clerk

Resident at Kashipur Station

North Eastern Railway
Izatnagar Division.

Re: O.A. No. 78/1992

Shri Mohd. Quasim Uddin

Son of Shri Samiuddin
ex. Additional Booking Clerk

Railway Station
Bilhaur Railway Station

North Eastern Railway.

Re: O.A. No. 941/1992

Shri Varinder Singh Pal

Son of Shri Dhan Singh Pal

Ex. Additional Booking Clerk
North Eastern Railway.

Railway Station
Kashipur.

Applicants

(All the above O.A.s applicants are A.O. in profile

C/o Shri B.S. Mainee, Advocate)

A.O. in profile

Re: O.A. No. 78/1992 versus

Union of India through:

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Railway

Resident at Railway Board

New Delhi.

Re: O.A. No. 941/1992 versus

2. The General Manager, North Eastern Railway

Resident at Gorakhpur.

Re: O.A. No. 941/1992 versus

3. The Divisional Railway Manager, North Eastern Railway

Resident at Izatnagar

Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri P.S. Mahendru)

For the Respondents Son of Shri B.S. Mainee and Advocate

Resident at New Delhi.

Re: O.A. No. 78/1992 versus

For the Respondents Son of Shri B.S. Mainee and Advocate

Resident at New Delhi.

Re: O.A. No. 941/1992 versus

For the Respondents Son of Shri B.S. Mainee and Advocate

Resident at New Delhi.

Re: O.A. No. 941/1992 versus

For the Respondents Son of Shri B.S. Mainee and Advocate

Resident at New Delhi.

ORDER

No. 101/92

Hon'ble Shri A.V. Haridasan, Vice Chairman (I)

All these cases involved similar facts and identical question of law and, therefore, they are being heard and disposed of by this common order. The applicants in all these cases were engaged as Volunteer Mobile Ticket Collectors/Mobile Booking Clerks and were all discharged prior to 17.11.1986. The applicant in O.A. No. 2422/92 was first engaged on 17.6.1984 and he had worked till 31.10.1984. The applicant in O.A. No. 1960/92 was first engaged on 22.5.1983 and worked upto 22.6.1983. The applicant in O.A. No. 77/93 was engaged as Mobile Booking Clerk from 1.3.1986 to 31.3.1986. The applicant in O.A. No. 465/93 was engaged as Mobile Booking Clerk from 27.5.1983 to 13.8.1983. The applicant in O.A. No. 1053/92 was engaged from 1.8.1983 to 23.12.1984 with intermittent break. The applicant in O.A. No. 76/92 was engaged as Mobile Ticket Collector from 23.3.1984 to 30.4.1984. The applicant in O.A. No. 904/92 worked as Mobile Booking Clerk from 18.5.1983 to 31.10.1984 with intermittent break. The applicant in O.A. No. 78/93 worked as Mobile Booking Clerk from 20.5.1983 to 18.9.1983 with intermittent break. Applicant in O.A. No. 941/92 was working as Mobile Booking Clerk from 18.5.1983 till 31.10.1984 with intermittent break. After they were discharged the applicants were not considered for re-engagement and regularisation. Booking Clerks who had rendered service prior to 17.11.1986 and were not re-engaged approached the Central Administrative Tribunal claiming re-engagement and regularisation. The Tribunal

directed the Railway Administration to re-engage the Mobile Booking Clerks to consider them for regularisation. The final decision in Usha Kumari Anand's case was reported in ATR 1989(2) 37. This relief has followed the judgement in Miss Neera Mehta's case. The Special Leave Petition filed by the respondents in Miss Neera Mehta's case was dismissed by the Supreme Court. Pursuant to the above the Railway Board issued order to the Railways to re-engage the Mobile Booking Clerks who had rendered service prior to 17.11.1986. The applicants who came to know about the above order of the Railway Board submitted their representations to the respondents requesting them to re-engage and to consider them for absorption in regular service but without success. The applicants have filed this application praying that the respondents may be directed to re-engage them as Volunteer Ticket Collectors/Mobile Booking Clerks and to grant them temporary status and regularise them in accordance with the decision of the Tribunal in Usha Kumari Anand's case.

2. The respondents have filed detailed reply in all these cases contesting the applications on various grounds. They contend that the application is barred by limitation and they also contend that the decision in Usha Kumari Anand's case is not applicable to the case of the applicants. 3. We have perused the materials available on record. ~~in~~ ~~of~~ ~~all~~ ~~we~~ ~~may~~ deal with the plea of limitation raised by the respondents. Even though the

-: 5 :-

all those applicants had been engaged as Mobile Booking Clerks before 17.11.1986. Pursuant to the judgement of the Tribunal in Neera Mehta's case, the Railway Board has issued a Circular dated 6.2.1990 to all the General Managers that Mobile Booking Clerks who have rendered service prior to 17.11.1986 and dis-engaged should be re-engaged as and when they approach them, and thereafter consider grant of temporary status and regularisation. In spite of this Circular of the Railway Board, the request of the applicants have not been considered by the respondents in the light of the above mentioned Circular of the Railway Board. In Usha Kumari Anand's case the Tribunal had given the following directions:

"Following the decision of this Tribunal in Neera Mehta's case and Sumir Kumar Mukherjee's case, we hold that the length of the period of service put in by the applicant in itself is not relevant."

"Admittedly, all those applicants had been engaged as Mobile Booking Clerks before 17.11.86. In the interest of justice, all of them deserve to be reinstated in service irrespective of the period of service put in by them. Those who have put in continuous service of more than 120 days, would be entitled to temporary status with all the attendant benefits. All persons should be considered for regularisation and permanent absorption in accordance with the provisions of the scheme. In the facts and circumstances of these cases, we do not, however, consider it appropriate to direct the respondents to pay back wages to the applicants on their re-employment in service. The period of service already put in by them before their service was terminated, would no doubt, count. Completion of three years period of service which is one of the conditions for regularisation and absorption."

Following the above judgement the Principal Bench of the Tribunal in Arvind Kumar & Ors. Vs. Union of India reported in ATJ 1996(1) 151 directed the respondents to

re-engage the applicants within a period of three months

from the date of receipt of the order and to consider

their absorption within a period of three years taking

into account the service rendered prior to their dis-

engagement also. In the light of the Memorandum dated

21.4.1982 and Memorandum dated 21.4.1982 and 24.5.1990

mentioned in the Railway Board letter dated 6.2.1990. This

decision of the Tribunal has been followed in Shri Sanjeev

Kumar Vs. Secretary, Ministry of Railways and Ors. in O.A.

(b) No. 964/91 decided on 7.3.1986. The applicants in all

these cases were engaged as Mobile Booking Clerks or

Volunteer Ticket Collectors and dis-engagement prior to

17.11.1986. They are in all respect similarly situated

as the applicant in Usha Kumari Anand's case, Arvind Kumar

and Sanjeev Kumar (Supra). Therefore, we do not find any

reason to deviate from the views taken in all the said

cases. The plea of limitation has to be overruled.

4. In the result the applications are disposed of

with a direction to the respondents to re-engage the

applicants in these cases as Mobile Booking Clerks and

Volunteer Ticket Collectors within a period of three

months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The case

of the applicants for grant of temporary status,

absorption etc. shall be considered by the respondents in

accordance with the rulings, rules and instructions in

that regard. The period of service, rendered by each of the

applicants prior to their dis-engagement shall also be

15

advice is given to the authority concerned and especially
-:- 7 :-

to be taken into account for the purpose of computing the
permitted required length of service while considering them for
absorption.

There is no order as to costs.

(R.K. Ahuja)
Member (A)

(A.V. Haridasan)
Vice Chairman (J)

Attested

Mittal
Placed
Coetz

Mittal