



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

R.A. No./100/86/2020  
O.A. No./100/942/2020  
M.A. No./100/2122/2020

**This the 07<sup>th</sup> Day of July, 2021**

Through Video Conferencing

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Sh. Janardan Sharma, Senior Citizen  
S/o late Sh. Parasram Sharma,  
Aged about 60 years  
Designation-superannuated as  
Part-time Vocational Banking Teacher (Group B) at RJSKV  
Railway Colony, Tughalkabad, Delhi. ...Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Varun Mudgil)

Versus

1. GNCT of Delhi, through its Chief Secretary  
Delhi Secretariat, IP Estate, New Delhi-110002.
2. Director, Directorate of Education  
GNCT of Delhi, Old Secretariat Building  
New Delhi-110054.
3. Dy. Director of Education (Vocational)  
Directorate of Education, GNCT of Delhi  
Plot No. 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Science Centre-3  
Building Link Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

... Respondents

(By Advocate : Ms. Esha Mazumdar)



## ORDER (ORAL)

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

This Review Application is filed with a prayer to review the order dated 25.09.2020. The O.A. was filed with a prayer to direct the respondents to treat the 28 years of part-time service of the applicant as holding good for sanction of pension and other benefits. The applicant worked as part-time Vocational Teacher in the Delhi Administration and retired on attaining the age of superannuation on 26.03.2020. The respondents did not sanction him the pension in view of the fact that he worked for a long time on part-time basis and he was not regularized.

2. In the OA we took note of the fact that notwithstanding the fact that the applicant worked for quite a long time, as part-time teacher, he was not regularized and the occasion to sanction of pension does not arise.

3. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the **Prem Singh vs. the State of U.P. & Ors.**, reported in (2019) 10 SCC 516. That was a case in which the U.P. Law, relating to retirement benefits were interpreted and their Lordships did not countenanced the distinction sought to be maintained in the context of regularization of service of part-time employees. In the instant case, there is no such provision involved much less a distinction was made.

Item No. 12



4. We do not find any merit in the RA and accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Aradhana Johri)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

*/sd/jyoti/mbt/ns*