

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

O.A. No. 535/93

~~P.A. No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 24/11/1993

Shri Panubhai Virabhai Vankar Petitioner

Mr. P. K. Bhatt, Mr. G. I. Desai, Advocate for the Petitioner(s)  
Mr. J. G. Chauhan

Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Mr. Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. N. B. Patel

: Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. V. Radhakrishnan

: Member (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

Shri Panubhai Virabhai Vankar  
At: Salad, Po. Ruvad,  
Ta. Karjan, Dist. Vadodara.

: Applicant

(Advocate: Mr. P. K. Bhatt,  
Mr. G. I. Desai, J. G. Chauhan)

Versus

1. Union of India  
Director General Deptt. of  
Post Sanchar Bhavan,  
Parliament Street,  
New Delhi.
2. Director of Postal Services  
(South Zone RMS Bhavan,  
Pratapgunj,  
Vadodara-2.
3. Sr. Superintendent of Post,  
Western Division,  
Vadodara-2.
4. Postmaster,  
Fatehgunj H.O.  
Vadodara-2.

: Respondents

(Advocate: Mr. Akil Kureshi)

ORAL ORDER

IN

OA/535/93

Date: 24/11/1993


Per: Hon'ble Mr. N. B. Patel

: Vice Chairman

The applicant has challenged his alleged oral termination from employment as a casual workman on the ground that such oral termination is in contravention of the provision of Section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act. In the application, it is stated that the applicant is terminated in March, 1991. The statement showing the number of working days of the applicant in 1988, <sup>1989</sup> and 1990 which is annexed with the application shows that in the year 1989 the applicant had worked for 299 days but in the year 1990 he had worked for only 219 days. In other words, during the

year preceding the date of the termination, the applicant had admittedly not worked for 240 days or more. There is, therefore, no question of the provision of Section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act having been contravened while terminating the applicant. However, Mr. Bhatt states that the applicant will be satisfied, if the respondents are directed to consider his case for re-engagement sympathetically, as and when an occasion for re-engagement arises, bearing in mind the number of working days of the applicant in the past. If the applicant makes a representation accordingly to the respondents, the respondents will consider his case for re-engagement, as and when any occasion for the same arises, bearing in mind the number of working days for which <sup>the applicant and the</sup> other terminated casual workmen might have worked. In view of this direction, Mr. Bhatt seeks permission to withdraw the application. Permission granted. Application stands disposed of as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

  
(V. Radhakrishnan)  
Member (A)

  
(N. B. Patel)  
Vice-Chairman

a.a.b.