

2

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application Nos. 518/91, 519/91, 521/91, 522/91
561/92, 520/91 & 560/92

Date of Decision: 9.7.1993

IN O.A.No.518/91	Kailash Chandra Behera	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.519/91	Biranjan Mukherjee	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.521/91	Sahadev Pradhan	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.522/91	Benudhar Swain	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.561/92	Maheswar Routray	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.520/91	Manoranjan Das	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
IN O.A.No.560/92	S.C.Mohapatra	Applicant (s)
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? *NO*
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ? *NO*

...

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

09 JUL 93


VICE-CHAIRMAN

6

8

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application Nos. 518/91, 519/91, 521/91
522/91, 561/92, 520/91 & 560/92

Date of Decision: 9.7.1993

In O.A.518/91	Kailash Chandra Behera	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.519/91	Biranjana Mukherjee	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.521/91	Sahadev Pradhan	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.522/91	Benudhar Swain	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.561/92	Maheswar Routray	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.520/91	Manoranjan Das	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In O.A.560/92	S.C.Mohapatra	Applicant
	Versus	
	Union of India & Others	Respondents
In all the cases: For the applicant		Mr. P.C. Mohapatra, Advocate
In O.A. Nos. 518/91, 519/91, 521/91, For the respondents 522/91, & 561/92		Mr. B. Pal & Mr. O.N. Ghosh, Standing Counsel
In O.A. Nos. 520/91 For the respondents and No. 560/92		Mr. R.C. Rath Standing Counsel (Rly. Administration)

JUDGMENT

MR.K.P.ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN, In all these applications the petitioners pray for regularisation of their services, as they have rendered services as Casual labourers.

2. In all these cases, the petitioners are Hot Weather Waterman employed as Casual labourers during the summer season; and they were appointed in some years ^{in the past.} Hence they have claimed regularisation.

2. In all these cases we have heard Mr.P.C.Mohapatra, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.B.Pal, learned Sr.Standing Counsel in Original Application Nos.518/91, 519/91, 521/91, 522/91 ^{and} 561/92 and in Original Application Nos.520/91 and 560/92, we have heard Mr.R.C.Rath, learned counsel for the opposite parties. Though all these cases were heard one after the other from counsel for both sides, we direct, ^{that} this common judgment will govern all the cases because they involve similar questions of fact and law.

3. Mr.P.C.Mohapatra, learned counsel for the petitioners in all these cases did not press his prayer for regularisation of the petitioners. Mr.Mohapatra solely confined his argument to his prayer that the petitioners should be given some work as and when available. We have heard Mr.B.Pal, learned Sr.Standing Counsel and Mr.R.C.Rath, learned Standing Counsel on this question.

4. We would direct that as and when work is available, Opposite Party No.3 may consider to give some work to the petitioners as Hot Weather Waterman and in case anyother work is available in any season, Opposite Party No. 3

may sympathetically consider the case of the petitioners in entrusting any other work to them.

5. Thus all these applications are accordingly disposed of. No cost.


MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

09 JUL 93


9.7.93.
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal
Cuttack Bench Cuttack
dated the 9.7.1993/ B.K.Sahoo

