

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH

Original Application No. 252 of 1995

DATED : 28.4.1995

Hon'ble Mr. S.Das Gupta, Member(A)  
Hon'ble Mr. T.L. Verma, Member(J)

1. Rajeev Lochana, S/o Shri Ram Lakhan Tripathi  
R/o Vill. Tikari, Post Kamala, Nagar, Allahabad.
2. Harikesh Yadav, S/o Shri Gajendra Prasad Yadav,  
R/o Vill Bhadousi, Post Garwara, Tehsil Sadeer,  
District Pratapgarh.
3. Rakesh Kumar, S/o Ram Dularey, R/o Printing  
Technology Colony, Teliyarganj, Allahabad.

Applicants.

By Advocate Km. T.N.S. Menon.

Versus

1. Union of India through the Controller Auditor  
General, New Delhi.
2. The Principal, Accountant General, Uttar Pradesh,  
Allahabad.

Respondents.

O R D E R (Oral)

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

Heard, Km.T.N.S. Menon, counsel for  
the petitioner on admission.

2. Three applicants have joined in filing  
this application seeking a direction to the respondent  
no.2 to enter their names in the seniority list  
of Casual Labour Register.

3. It appears from the facts averred that

.....pg.2/-

all the 3 applicants have been engaged ~~with~~<sup>by</sup> respondent no. 2 in various ~~cases~~<sup>stages</sup>. The applicant no. 1 was last engaged in 1991 whereas the applicant no. 2 was last engaged in 1988. The applicant no. 3 was dis-engaged in the year 1985 itself. The case is, therefore, highly time barred.

4. We have, however, seen that while deciding O.A. 1112 of 1991, a bench of this Tribunal had directed the Accountant General (U.P.) to enter the name<sup>s</sup> of the petitioners in the register of casual worker if, the same ~~was~~<sup>is</sup> being maintained and to maintain such register incase ~~not to be~~<sup>it was being</sup> maintained at that time. The present applicants have averred that they have submitted representations to respondent no. 2 for entering their names in Casual Labour Register but, their representations have not yet been acted upon. The applicant no. 1 is stated to have represented by his letter dated 03.10.1994 (Annexure -I). The applicant no. 2 and 3 are stated to have submitted representations on 12.9.1994 and 03.9.1994 respectively (Annexure IA and IB). Although the application itself <sup>is</sup> time-barred and we do not propose to enter into merits, ~~however~~, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondents to dispose of the said representations. We



:: 3 ::

accordingly direct the respondents to consider all the three representations stated to have been submitted by the applicants and disposed of by a speaking order within a period of 3 months from the date of communication of this order. The application is disposed of at the admission stage. *in the aforesaid v. direct*

*J. J. J.*  
Member (J)

*W. C.*  
Member (A)

/M.M./