

## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

O.A./T.A./R.A.No. .... 89 [redacted] ..... 1993

Nirmal K. Ghosh et al. Applicant (s)

Versus

Union of India et al. Respondent (s)

Sr. No	Date	Order with Signature
1.	26.2.93	<p>In this application the petitioners pray for a direction to the Opposite Parties for giving them appointment <del>appointment</del> on rehabilitation scheme as they are cured Leprosy Patient. The Petitioners have filed this application without being represented by a counsel. Petitioners are not present. Shri D.N. Misra learned Standing Counsel for the Railway Administration <del>is</del> present in court, was requested to assist the Court. I have perused the pleadings. I have heard Mr. D.N. Mishra learned Standing Counsel for the Railways. Rightly Mr. D.N. Mishra submitted that this Bench has no jurisdiction to entertain this application because the petitioners do not hold a civil post under the Government and therefore they do not come within the purview of Section 14 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. It was further submitted by Mr. Misra that the petitioners could invoke the jurisdiction of the Hon'ble <del>xxxxxxx</del> High Court. I feel there is substantial force in the contention of Mr. Misra and therefore, it is held that this application is not maintainable. After retaining the first copy of the petition rest may be returned to the petitioners for filing the same in the appropriate forum if so advised. The IPO filed in <del>all</del> this cases be returned to the petitioners.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[Signature] Vice-Chairman</p>