

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH.

Registration O.A. No. 136 of 1992

Udai Raj Applicant.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

And

Registration O.A. No. 1266 of 1991

Rajeev Kapoor Applicant.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

And

Registration O.A. No. 1265 of 1991

Krishna Raj Tewari Applicant.

.....

..... Respondents.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

And

Registration O.A. No. 1642 of 1992

Km. Sujata Dhusia Applicant.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

And

Registration O.A. No. 968 of 1992

Jai Prakash Pandey Applicant.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

And

✓ Registration O.A. No. 197 of 1992

S.S.Z. Naqvi Applicant.

Versus

Union of India
and others Respondents.

Hon. Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.
Hon'ble Mr. K. Obayya, Member (A)

(Hon. Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.)

Heard Sri Lalji Sinha, A.K. Gaur and Prashant Mathur
Counsel for the Railway Administration and Sri K.G. Saxena, counsel for the applicants. As the similar questions of facts and law are involved in the aforementioned case and the reliefs sought for by the applicants are the same, we are going to dispose of these cases by a common judgment.

2. Under the Scheme of Combating Ticketless Travel on the Indian Railways, the applicants were engaged as Volunteer Ticket Collectors. The applicant of O.A. No.136 of 1992 worked under the aforesaid scheme as Volunteer Ticket Collector from 22.3.1986 to 31.3.1986 with two rest on 26.3.1986 to 27.3.1986 under the Chief Inspector Tickets, Northern Railway Allahabad and other applicants were also engaged in such manner but thereafter, they were not engaged. Thereafter, it has come to their knowledge, that ~~reengagement~~ re-engagement is being done vide the Railway Board's circular dated 6.2.1990, the applicants also approached to the Railway Administration and made representations but they have not ^{been} re-engaged and that is why, they have approached the Tribunal. We have decided similar and identical ~~other case~~ containing same relief. In those case, we have directed the

respondents to consider and analyse the cases of Mible Ticket Collectors and to find out if any scheme can be framed by them by laying down a particular criteria for re-engaging them on casual basis. Let a scheme be framed within a period of two months from the date of communication of this order. We have decided similar case in O.A. No. 131 of 1992 Lalji Shukla Vs. Union of India and others. This judgment will form part of the judgment given in O.A. No. 131 of 1992 (Lalji Shukla Vs. Union of India and others).

Let copy of this judgment be placed on the files of O.A.1266 of 1991, O.A. No.1265 of 1991, O.A.1664 of 1992, O.A. 968 of 1992, O.A. 197 of 1992.]

Sd/-
Member(A)

Sd/-
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 11.01.1993
(n.u.)