

OPEN COURT

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD  
ADDITIONAL BENCH AT ALLAHABAD

\* \* \* \* \*

Allahabad : Dated this 9th day of April, , 1996  
Original Application No.221 of 96  
District : Jhansi

COURT:-

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

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

Narendra Kumar Son of Shri Bhagwan Das  
R/o RB I, 950-E, TRS Colony, Nagra,  
Jhansi.

(By Sri Rakesh Verma, Advocate)

..... Petitioner

Versus

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

..... Respondents

ORDER (Oral)

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

The applicant in this OA is the son of a railway employee 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". The applicant, it is stated, was minor at the time when the aforesaid orders were issued by the Railway Board and only after he has attained the age of majority, he sought employment under the "loyal quota". He submitted representation to the Railway Board and thereafter approached this

W.C.

Tribunal for a direction to appoint him in the "loyal quota". The application was disposed of in limine by a direction to the respondents to consider and dispose of the representation. It now appears that by similar orders dated 6-9-1995, the representation of the applicant has been turned down. Thus, the applicant has filed this OA challenging the aforesaid order and praying for a direction to the respondents to consider the applicant for appointment under the "loyal quota".

2. We have seen from the order dated 6-9-1995 that the representation of the applicant has been turned down on the ground that his request 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.

3. We are, therefore, of the view that the respondents have rightly rejected the representation of the applicant and as such the rejection cannot be challenged successfully.

4. In view of the foregoing we find no merits in the application and the application is dismissed in limine.

*H. J. Dube*  
Member (J)

*H. S. Dube*  
Member (A)

Dube/