



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAMMU BENCH, JAMMU**

Hearing through video conferencing

T.A.61/06345/2020

This the 16th day of February, 2021

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. MOHD JAMSHED, MEMBER (A)**

Rattan Lal Raina, Son of Shri Shiv Ji Raina, R/o Quarter No. 27-H,
Muthi Migrant Camp, Jammu. Aged 40 years. At present working R&B
Construction Div 3rd, Jammu.

.....Applicant

(Advocate:- Ms. Veenu Gupta)

Versus

1. State of Jammu & Kashmir, through Principal Secretary, Public Works Department, Civil Secretariat, Srinagar.
2. Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Roads & Building Division, Jammu.
3. Executive Engineer, R&B, Medical College Division, Jammu.
4. Mr Ravinder Pandita, Son of Dwarka Nath, Works Supervisor, C/o Respondent No. 3.

.....Respondents

(Advocate:- Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General)

ORDER
[O R A L]

Delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman: -

The applicant states that he was engaged as permanent daily labour/temporary daily labour by the respondents at various points of time. His grievance is that though the persons similarly situated to him, was extended the benefit of SRO 59 of 1990, dated 06.02.1990, he was denied the same. The applicant filed SWP No. 1654/2004 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir at Jammu, claiming relief in this behalf. The SWP has since been transferred to this Tribunal in view of re-organisation of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and renumbered as TA No.6345/2020.

2. Today, we heard Ms. Veenu Gupta, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Sudesh Magotra, learned Deputy Advocate General for the respondents.

4. The applicant, no doubt, has some grievance over the denial of the extension of benefit of SRO 59 of 1990 dated 06.02.1990, particularly when a person similar to him, i.e. respondent No.4, was extended the same. The respondents in their counter affidavit, however, stated that the benefit under SRO 59 of 1990 was extended to the applicant through an order dated 22.09.2005, that is w.e.f. 01.04.1990. With this, the grievance of the applicant stands redressed. Nothing remains to be decided in this TA

5. The TA is accordingly dismissed as infructuous. There shall be no order as to costs.

(MOHD JAMSHED)
MEMBER (A)
Sunil/jyoti/Dsn

(JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN