

9

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH : CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:417 OF 1989.

Date of decision : October 10, 1990.

J.M. Patnaik and others Applicants

-Versus-

Union of India and others Respondents

For the applicants : M/s. C.V.Murty, C.M.K.Murty,
S.K.Rath, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Tahali Dalai, Learned
Additional Standing Counsel
(Central)

C O R A M:

THE HON'BLE MR. B.R.PATEL, VICE-CHAIRMAN

A N D

THE HON'BLE MR. N. SENGUPTA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

-
1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? Yes.
 2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ? Yes.
-

J U D G M E N T

N.SENGUPTA, MEMBER (J),

This application has been filed by 67 persons, who were working as Seasonal Khalasis under the Director Cum Superintending Engineer, Eastern Rivers Division, Central Water Commission and the reliefs claimed by the applicants are for direction to the Respondents to quash the order at Annexure-3 giving notice to terminate their (the applicants') employment prior to the last day till which their appointment could ordinarily have continued.

2. For what we are going to state below, it is not very necessary to set out all the allegations made in the application or in the counter in reply to the application. Admittedly, the applicants are Seasonal Khalasis and they were appointed as temporary work-charged Seasonal Khalasis and their employments were to cease on different dates in the month of October/November last year. By Annexure-3 their services were directed to be terminated with effect from 30.9.1989 (AN). On the date of filing of the application, an interim order staying the operation of Annexure-3 was passed. By the order a direction was given not to terminate the services of the applicants till the dates mentioned against their names in the order dated 18.5.1989, vide Annexure- 1. Since even according to the claim of the applicants, their services were only till

Handwritten signature
10/10

October, November last year, no useful purpose could be ^{served} passed by delivering a fullfledged judgment. However, we would say that the reasons assigned by this Tribunal in O.A. No.391 of 1989 disposed of on 31.10.1989 would also apply ^{also} to the facts of the present case. The case is accordingly disposed of. There would be no order as to costs.

B. Mohanty
.....
VICE-CHAIRMAN



M. S. Sengupta
.....
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Cuttack Bench, Cuttack/K.Mohanty