

RESERVED

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD
ADDITIONAL BENCH AT ALLAHABAD

* * * *

Allahabad : Dated this 18 th day of March, 1996

CORAM: :-

Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr. T.L. Verma, J.M.

I. Original Application No.205 of 1996.

Rajeev Kumar Nigam S/o Shri Ramesh Chandra Nigam
R/o House No.97/3(5), Near Khati
Baba Temple, Dildar Nagar, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager, Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

II. Original Application No.206 of 1996
Nafis Ahmed S/o Shri Kamal Ahmed
R/o House No.23, Purbiya Tola,
Premnagar, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager, Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

III. Original Application No.207 of 1996
Mohd. Hayat S/o Shri Abdul Hamid,
R/o Momin Compound, Isai Ka Tola,
Prem Nagar, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager, Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Central Railway, Jhansi.

.

IV. Original Application No. 208 of 1976

Vikram Singh S/o Shri K.K. Singh R/o House
No. 2482/2, Behind Refugee Colony, New Officers
Bungalow, Civil Lines, Jhansi.

(By Sir Rakesh Verma, Advocate,)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

V. Original Application No. 209 of 1996
Khushi Lal S/o Shri Harbana, R/o House No. 9,
Kachchiyana, Pulliya No. 9,
Near Rajpoot School,
Jhansi-284 001

(By Sir Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

VI. Original Application No. 210 of 1996

Raju S/o Smt. Ganga Devi (Widow of late
Shri Kishori Singh) R/o 492, Khushpura,
Near Bombay Bakery, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

VII. Original Application No.211 of 1996

Bhishma S/o Shri Ishwari R/o Village
Ghori, Tehsil-Palwal, District-
Faridabad.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

VIII. Original Application No.212 of 1996

Saleem Khan S/o Shri Wahid Khan R/o House No.
132/2, Schoolpura, Garhiya Phatak,
Near Chhotey Khati Baba, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

VIII.A. Original Application No.213 of 1996

Vijay Kumar aged x S/o Shri Ram Das
R/o 560/1, Kushipura, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay.V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Mahager,
Central Railway, Bhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

IX. Original Application No.222 of 1996

Durga Prasad S/o Shri Ram Charan R/o House No.191,
Kachhiyana, Puliya No.9, Subhash School Ka Gate,
Jhansi.

(Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

X. Original Application No.224 of 1996

Rakesh Kumar Srivastava S/o Shri Hanuman Prasad
Srivastava, Ex.T.T.E./NER/SEE, R/o Mohalla
Belwadandi, Gandhi Nagar, Basti.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

Union of India through the General
Manager, North Eastern Railway, Gorakhpur.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

XI. Original Application No.225 of 1996

Bindeshwari Prajapati S/o Shri Dwarika,
R/o Village & Post Kazrat, P.S. Zapla,
District-Palamau.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through the General Manager
Eastern Railway, Calcutta.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Eastern Railway,
Mughalsarai.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

XII. Original Application No.228 of 1996

Wasif S/o Shri Nazeer Khan R/o Momin Compound,
Idgah Road, Isai Ka Tola, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

XIII. Original Application No.230 of 1996

Ravi Prakash S/o Shri Baboo Lal R/o 231/1,
Outside, Datiya Darwaja, Pathariya,
Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway,
Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

CONNECTED WITH

XIV. Original Application No.235 of 1996

Mohd. Haseen S/o Shri Mohd. Saleem R/o House
No.111, Darigran, Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Jhansi.

. Respondents

O R D E R

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, A.M.

All these applications are based on similar facts and involve ~~the~~ similar controversy. As such all these cases are being decided by a common order.


2. When these cases came up for admission, we heard learned counsel for the applicants and also perused the pleadings in the OAs. The applicants in the OAs are sons of railway employees who did not participate in the railway strikes in the year 1974. It is stated that the railway authorities had issued certain orders that those railway employees who did not participate in the railway strikes would be rewarded by the grant of employment to sons/wards of such employees in the so-called "loyal quota". All the applicants, it is stated, were minors at ~~that~~ time when the aforesaid orders were issued by the railway board and only after they have ^{attained} ~~achieved~~ the age of majority, ^{they} sought employment under the "loyal quota". They submitted representation to the railway board and thereafter approached this Tribunal for a direction to appoint them in the "loyal quota". All the applications were disposed of in limine by a direction to the respondents to consider and dispose of their representations. It now appears that by ^{similar} ~~the so-called~~ orders dated 6-9-1995, the representations of these applicants have been turned down. Thus, the applicants have filed these OAs challenging the aforesaid order and praying for a direction to the respondents to consider the applicants for appointment under the "loyal quota".


3. We have seen from the order dated 6-9-1995 that

that the representations of the applicants have been turned down on the ground that their requests for employment under the so called "loyal quota" cannot be considered at this stage after 21 years. We have carefully considered the matter. We are of the view that an assurance which was given to the so called loyal workers in 1974 cannot be an open-ended one. There is nothing on record to indicate that the railways had assured the so called loyal workers that their sons/wards shall be considered for employment against "loyal quota" even after so many years after they attain the age of majority.

4. We are, therefore, of the view that the respondents have rightly rejected the representations of the applicants and as such the rejection cannot be challenged successfully.

5. In view of the foregoing we find no merits in these applications and all these applications are dismissed in limine.


Member (J)


Member (A)

Dube/