

Mr. G. A. R. Dosa
V. Narashagh

CAT / J / II

(A)

(A) CAT

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

Mr. D. W. Mistick
2-K-Porte

O.A./T.A./R.A.No..... 51 1995

(59)

1995

D.A./T.A./R.A. No..... 31 1995

110

K. L. Kao and another.....Applicant(s)

Versus

Versus
Uzair A. Indra Seaw Respondent(s)

Sr. No.	Date	Order with Signature
		<p style="text-align: center;">REGISTER</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>S</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Registrar</p> <p>1 29-9-95 The petitioners are permitted to file joint application. Thus the M.A. No.685 of 1995 is disposed of.</p> <p>Admit. Issue notice to the Respondents. Counter-affidavit shall be filed within four weeks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>T. A. R.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">MEMBER (ADMN.)</p> <p><u>2. ORDER DT. 18.6.2001.</u></p> <p>Heard Mr. G. A. R. Dora, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. D. N. Mishra, learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents.</p> <p>Two applicants, who are retrenched casual workers, prayed for their re-engagement on various grounds. Applicants as casual labourers served under the Railways at visakhapatnam. Their Grievance is that inspite of a policy decision in letter dt. 22.10.80 that the senior casual labourers should be</p>
	29-9-95	<p>J. P. O. of the is filed.</p> <p><i>h</i></p> <p>28.09.95</p> <p>In this ap up 19, the pray for a on casual l for Reg</p> <p><i>h</i></p> <p>28.09.95</p> <p>Regis <i>S</i></p> <p>For ad <i>S</i></p> <p>28/9</p> <p><i>B</i></p>

Serial No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature
		<p>re-engaged first their cases have not been considered and freshers have been engaged as casual labourers. Inspite of repeated representation under Annexure-A/6, the Railways at Waltair Division have not taken any action.</p> <p>After going through the pleadings, we are of the view that this Bench lacks territorial jurisdiction to decide this case on merits. Applicants admittedly are resident of Visakhapatnam and are retrenched casual employees of the Waltair Division. The cause of action also arises there. Under Rule-6 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987 this Bench lacks jurisdiction. The application is accordingly dismissed for want of jurisdiction. No costs.</p> <p><u>Somnath Som</u> (SOMNATH SOM) VICE-CHIEF JUDGE</p> <p><u>G. Narasimham</u> (G. NARASIMHAM) MEMBER (JUDICIAL)</p> <p><u>KNM/CM.</u></p> <p><i>Note to all Reports may be sent to the Court Post.</i></p> <p><i>AM 6/4/95 SO (8)</i></p> <p><i>For hearing Relevant filed</i></p> <p><i>Sub S16 Bench</i></p> <p><i>free copy of the order dt. 18.6.95 given to the both counsel.</i></p> <p><i>Path 29/6 Path S-O</i></p>