

5

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH; CUTTACK.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 301 OF 1993.

Cuttack, this the 5th day of August, 1999.

KRISHNA CHANDRA DAS. APPLICANT.
VERSUS.
UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS. RESPONDENTS.

FOR INSTRUCTIONS

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

G. Narasimham
(G. NARASIMHAM)
MEMBER(JUDICIAL)

Somnath Som
(SOMNATH SOM)
VICE-CHAIRMAN
5.8.99

6
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 301 OF 1993.

Cuttack, this the 5th day of August, 1999.

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR. SOMNATH SOM, VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE G. NARASIMHAM, MEMBER (JUDICIAL).

..

Krishna Chandra Das,
S/o. Prahallad Das,
Vill. Gabapadar, Ps. Balugan,
At, present Ward Boy,
G.C., C. R. P. F. Hospital,
Bhubaneswar, Dist. Khurda.

.....

Applicant.

By legal practitioner; Mr. J. M. Mohanty, Advocate.

-Versus -

1. Union of India represented through its Secretary, Home, New Delhi.
2. D.I.G.P (Deputy Inspector General of Police),
3. A.D.I.G.P. (Additional Deputy Inspector General of Police).
4. 2 I/C, B. Ratam

(Respondents No. 2 to 4, Office of the D.I.G.P., Group Centre, C. R. P. F., Orissa, Bhubaneswar, At-Bhubaneswar, Dist. Khurda.)

.. Respondents.

By legal practitioner; Mr. S. B. Jena, Additional Standing Counsel.

...

S. Som

O R D E R

MR. SOMNATH SOM, VICE-CHAIRMAN.

In this Original Application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, applicant has prayed for quashing the order of termination dated 26.5.1993 at Annexure-4. The second prayer is for a direction to the Respondents to regularise the services of applicant as Wardboy.

2. Respondents have appeared and filed counter.

3. We have heard Mr. S. Sarkar, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. S. B. Jena, learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the Respondents and have also perused the records.

4. Respondents, in their counter have pointed out that applicant was appointed against a combatised post. They have enclosed the advertisement at Annexure-1 for the post of Wardboy/Girl (Follower), wherein under the general condition and instruction it has been mentioned that the post is a combatised post. As the applicant was holding a combatised post, under the CRPF Hospital, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain his grievance under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, with regard to service conditions of members of Armed forces of the Union. Under section 3 of the CRPF Act, 1949, CRPF is an armed force and the present applicant being a combatised armed force of the CRPF, is a member of the force and therefore, this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to deal with his service grievance.

S. Som