

13
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH;CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NOS. 454/97, 465/98, 301/99
AND 550/2000
Cut,ack this the 17th day of April/2003

IN O.A.454/97

Purna Ch. Parida & Ors. ... Applicants
-Versus-
Union of India & Others ... Respondents

IN O.A.465/98

G. Bhujang . Rao & Ors. ... Applicants
-Versus-
Union of India & Others ... Respondents

IN O.A.301/99

Gangadhar Behera & Others ... Applicants
-Versus-
Union of India & Others ... Respondents

IN O.A.550/2000

B. Mohapatra & Others ... Applicants
-Versus-
Union of India & Others ... Respondents

FOR INSTRUCTIONS

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? 7/4
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunal or not ? 7/4

17/04/03
(M.R. MOHANTY)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

(B.N. SOM)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NOS. 454/97, 465/98, 301/99 AND
550/2000

Cuttack this the 11th day of April/2003

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.N. SOM, VICE-CHAIRMAN
AND
THE HON'BLE SHRI M.R. MOHANTY, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

...

IN O.A. 454/97

1. Purno Chandra Parida, aged about 41 years,
S/o. Sukram Parida, a resident of Village: Bachhara
PO-Jatni, District : Khurda
2. Surendranath Subudhi, aged about 41 years,
S/o. V.N. Subudhi, a resident of Village: Bachhara
PO-Jatni, Dist: Khurda
3. Suda san Sahoo, aged about 38 years, S/o. B.K. Sahoo
a resident of Village : Bhansar, PO-Harirapur,
Dist: Khurda
4. Prafulla Kumar Mangaray, aged about 38 years, S/o.
P.N. Mangaray, a resident of Village- Behenta, PO-
Garhmatipara, District - Puri
5. Bijaya Kumar Nanda, aged about 41 years, S/o. K.C.
Nanda, a resident of Village: Dhalpur, PO-Dhalpur
Dist: Dhenkanal
6. D.B. Baido, aged about 40 years, S/o. D.A. Naidu, a
resident of Village : Jatni, PO: Jatni, Dist- Khurda
7. Babaji Charan Rout, aged about 40 years, S/o. B.B.
Rout, a resident of Village: Raghunathpur, PO- Barang,
Dist: Khurda
8. Nimai Charan Nayak, aged about 36 years, S/o. J. Nayak,
a resident of Village/PO- Sarakana, District- Khurda
9. Bhagirathi Behera, aged about 36 years, S/o. R.M.
Behera, a resident of Village: Niranjapur, PO- Kantia,
Dist: Khurda
10. Tra Lokyanath Dash, aged about 39 years, S/o. P.C.
Dash, a resident of Village : Rajendrapur, PO- Kabirpur
Dist- Cuttack
11. Tripath Samantray, aged about 36 years, S/o. B.N.
Samantray, a resident of Village: Udayapur, PO- Beraboi,
Dist - Puri
12. Abhimanyu Mhandayatray, aged about 41 years, S/o.
Y. Ray, a resident of Village: Jharkata, PO- Mandarbasta
Dist- Khurda

13. Sareswar Sahoo, aged about 40 years, S/o.S.S.Sahoo, a resident of Village : Rajabazar, PO:Jatni, Dist-Khurda
14. Santosh Kumar Panigrahi, aged about 37 years, S/o.G.P.Panigrahi, a resident of Village:Harijan Sahi, PO-Berhampur, Dist-Ganjam
15. Anath Sethi, aged about 37 years, S/o.N.Sethi, a resident of Village:Bachhara, PO:Jatni, Dist-Khurda
16. Arakha Behera, aged about 37 years, S/o.N.K.Behera, a resident of Village:Raghunathpur, PO-Barang, Dist-Khurda
17. Kapil Nath Nayak, aged about 41 years, S/o.P.Nayak a resident of Vill-Bachhara, PO-Jatni, Dist-Khurda

All are Registered Substitutes under Divisional Superintendent, Khurda Road, South Eastern Railway/ East Coast Railway, Khurda Road Division, Jatni, District : Khurda

...

Applicants

By the Advocates

M/s.Biswajit Mohanty-I
S.Patra

-VERSUS-

1. Union of India represented through General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach, Calcutta, West Bengal
2. Divisional Railway Manager(P), Khurda Road, South Eastern Railways, Jatni, Dist-Khurda
3. Divisional Railway Manager, Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railway, Jatni, District:Khurda
4. Divisional Transport Inspector(C) Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railways, Jatni, District:Khurda

...

Respondents

By the Advocates

M/s.B. Pal
P.C.Panda
S.K.Ojha

IN O.A.NO.465/98

1. G.Bhujang Rao, aged about 47 years, S/o.Late Chalapati Rao, At:Balichhak Sahi, PO-Jatni, Dist-Khurda
2. Harihar Mohapatra, aged about 44 years, S/o.Banchhanidhi Mohapatra, At/PO-Haladipada, Dist-Puri
3. Pitambar Baral, aged about 44 years, S/o.Late Rama Chandra Baral, Village/PO-Guali Gorda, Dist-Puri
4. Kelu Charan Pradhan, aged about 45 years, S/o.Balabhadra Pradhan, At:Mandarbasti, PO-Salepur, Dist-Puri

5. Purn Chandra Baral, aged about 44 years, S/o.Late Rama Chandra Baral, Vill/PO-Guali Gorda, Via:Belanga, Dist-Puri
6. Ajay Kumar Bharimal, aged about 44 years, S/o.Prabhakar Bharimal, At: Dokanda, PO-Kanas, Dist-Puri
7. Purn Chandra Biswal, aged about 44 years, S/o.Bhabani Biswal, At:Nuagarh, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
8. Promod Kumar Bhola, aged about 45 years, S/o.Pabana Bhola, At/PO-Ramachandi, Dist-Puri
9. Upendra Jena, aged about 45 years, S/o.Lingaraj Jena, At: Eatal, PO:Motari, Dist-Puri
10. Sri Mayanath Parida, aged about 45 years, S/o.Late Nidhi Parida, At:Chanagorada, PO-Patanakia, Dist-Puri
11. Rajkumare Jena, aged about 44 years, S/o.Late Prahlad Jena, At:Eatal, PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
12. Pramoda Kumar Pradhan, aged about 45 years, S/o.Late Kailash Chandra Pradhan, At:Gobardhanpur, PO-Pipili, Dist-Puri
13. Trinath Mangaraj, aged about 45 years, S/o.Rahas Mangaraj, At:Aswathapari, PO-Kanas, Dist-Puri
14. Gandharb Biswal, aged about 45 years, S/o.Bhabani Biswal, At:Nuagarh, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
15. Bipin Kumar Balbantary, aged about 46 years, S/o. Jayakumshna Balbantary, At/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
16. Nirajan Balabantary, aged about 46 years, S/o.Arta Balabantary, At/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
17. Raghu Nath Pradhan, aged about 45 years, S/o.Sambhu Pradhan, At: Khairikuda, PO-Guali Gorda, Dist-Puri
18. Sri Nagarjuna Mohapatra, aged about 45 years, S/o.Bhabani Mohapatra, At:Aragad, PO-Godiput Matiapara, Dist-Puri
19. Pabitra Mohan Pradhan, aged about 45 years, S/o. Kailash Chandra Pradhan, At:Gobardhanpur, PO-Pipili, Dist-Puri
20. Ashok Kumar Paikray, aged about 45 years, S/o. Dibyalingh Paikray, At:Manitiri, PO-Godoput Matiapara, Dist-Puri
21. Krupa Indhu Mohapatra, aged about 45 years, S/o.Late Prahlad Mohapatra, At/PO: Kantia, Dist-Puri
22. Sopanwar Mohapatra, aged about 45 years, S/o.Late Prahlad Mohapatra, At/PO-Kantia, Dist-Puri
23. Debraj Rana, aged about 45 years, S/o.Budhinath Rana, At:Botul, PO: Motari, Dist-Puri
24. Gandu Dehury, aged about 45 years, S/o.Mayadhar Dehury, At: Nakhua, PO-Mahapada, Dist-Dhenkanal
25. Bibhu Bhusan Jena, aged about 45 years, S/o.Bamdev Jena, At:Podapada, PO; Arugul, Dist-Khurda

- 17
26. Pradeep Kumar Jena, aged about 44 years, S/o.Nanda Kishore Jena, At:Haripur, PO:Godiput Matiapara, Dist-Puri
 27. Subash Chandra Panda, aged about 44 years, S/o.Surendranath Panda, At:Haripur, PO:Godiput Matiapara, Dist-Puri
 28. Rabin Kanath Mohapatra, aged about 45 years, S/o. Bansiphar Mohapatra, At:Parapada, PO:Godiput Matiapara, Dist-Puri
 29. Bhaskar Rana, aged about 45 years, S/o.Purna Chandra Rana, At:Khudapur, PO-Bhimpur Padampur, Dist-Puri

... Applicants

By the Advocates

M/s.Biswajit
Mohanty - I
S.Patra

-Versus-

1. Union of India represented through General Manager South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach, Calcutta, West Bengal
2. Divisional Railway Manager (P), Khurda Road, South Eastern Railways, Jatni, Dist-Khurda
3. Divisional Railway Manager, Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railway, Jatni, Dist-Khurda
4. Divisional Transport Inspector(C), Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railway, Jatni, Dist-Khurda

... Respondents

By the Advocates

Mr.C.R.Mishra
Mr.B.Pal

IN O.A.NO.301/99

1. Gangadhar Behera, aged about 42 years, S/o.Krushma Behera, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
2. Chandrakanta Parida, aged about 40 years, S/o.Bhikari Parida, a resident of Vill-Jagadalpur, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
3. Akshay Harichandan, aged about 41 years, S/o.Dhaneswar Harichandan, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
4. Bisuram Mangaraj, aged about 39 years, Son of Late Agadhar Mangaraj, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
5. Nalu Martha, aged about 42 years, Son of Kalu Martha a resident of Vill/PO-Ghoradia, Dist-Puri
6. Sarat Kumar Dalai, aged about 42 years, Son of Bhimsen Dalai a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
7. Hemanta Kumar Harichandan, aged about 39 years, S/o. Debaraj Harichandan, a resident of Vill-Gada Kalupada, PO-Motari, Dist-Puri

8. Dukhi Nyama Palai, aged about 40 years, S/o. Abhimanyu Palai, a resident of Vill/Jagadapur, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
9. Sanjay Baral, aged about 39 years, S/o. Bhimsen Baral a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
10. Bharat Kumar Balabantaray, aged about 39 years, S/o. late Pitabas Balabantaray, a resident of Vill/Jagadapur, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
11. Sarat Kumar Patra, aged about 42 years, S/o. Brajabandhu Patra, a resident of Vill/PO-Birapurusottampur, Dist-Puri
12. Swadhin Kumar Nayak, aged about 39 years, S/o. Babaji Nayak, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
13. Bijay Kumar Samantaray, aged about 41 years, S/o. late Pabani Samantaray, a resident of Vill/Jagadapur, PO-Delang, Dist-Puri
14. Subash Chandra Balabantaray, aged about 39 years, S/o. Baikuntha Balabantaray, a resident of Vill/Jagadapur PO-Delanga, Dist-Puri
15. Gopinath Harichandan, aged about 40 years, S/o. late Gobind Harichandan, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
16. Ratnakar Mohapatra, aged about 41 years, S/o. late Kalucharan Mohapatra, a resident of Vill-Sudhagar, PO-Tipuri, Dist-Puri
17. Gunanidhi Mohapatra, aged about 40 years, S/o. late Kakata Mohapatra, a resident of Vill-Sudhagar, PO-Tipuri, Dist-Puri
18. Pramod Kumar Harichandan, aged about 41 years, S/o. Brundhan Harichandan, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
19. Krushna Chandra Balabantaray, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. Baikuntha Balabantaray, a resident of Vill-Jagadapur, PO-Delanga, Dist-Puri
20. Kudart Khan, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. late Hamid Khan, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
21. Prakash Kumar Chhotaray, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. Gangadhar Chhotaray, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
22. Madhusudan Samantaray, aged about 40 yrs., S/o. late Kuber Samantaray, a resident of Vill/PO-Balabhadrapur, Dist-Puri
23. Narendra Champati, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. late Upendra Champati, a resident of Vill/PO-Motari, Dist-Puri
24. Duttibhan Chhotaray, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. late Banchhidhi Chhotaray, a resident of Vill/PO-Balabhadrapur Dist-Puri
25. Sridhar Patra, aged about 39 yrs., S/o. Somanath Patra, a resident of Vill-Birapurusottampur, PO-Pipili, Dist-Puri
26. Suryamodi Samal, aged about 42 yrs., Son of late Gopinath Samal, at-Baharpampu, PO-Ghanatala, Dist-Cuttack

27. Surata Chandra Paikaray, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. late Natabar Paikaray, a resident of Vill-Jagadapur, PO-Delanga, Dist-Puri
28. Bhaskar Palai, aged about 39 yrs, S/o. late Harihar Palai, a resident of Village-Jagadapur, PO-Delanga, Dist-Puri
29. Gopinath Sahoo, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. late Ghana Sahoo, a resident of Vill-Uspadar, PO-Kalupada, Dist-Khurda
30. Bharat Kumar Bhatta, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. Kamgati Bhatta, a resident of Vill-Sailo Nuagaon, PO-Gobindapur, Dist-Puttack
31. Siba Prasad Pradhan, aged about 39 yrs., S/o. Hadibandhu Pradhan, a resident of Vill-Mundal, PO-Kalupada, Dist-Khurda
32. Tutun Mohanty, aged about 40 yrs., S/o. Bhagabat Mohanty, a resident of Vill-Rampa, PO-Barimount, Dist-Jajpur
33. Brundaban Pradhan, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. Daitari Pradhan, a resident of Vill-Nipur, PO-Singh Barampur, Dist-Puri
34. Pravalakar Mangaraj, aged about 39 yrs, S/o. Bhaskar Mangaraj, a resident of vill-Kariapada, PO-Ghodadia, Dist-Puri
35. Ullash Baliarsingh @ Ullash Chandra, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. Bibakar Baliarsingh, a resident of Vill-Kamuna, PO-Aragal, Dist-Puri
36. Gundina Pradhan, aged about 39 yrs., S/o. Prahallad Pradhan, a resident of Vill-Jamuna, PO-Aragal, Dist-Puri
37. Susan Kumar Martha, aged about 40 yrs., S/o. Prafulla Kumar Martha, a resident of Vill-Jamuna, PO-Aragal, Dist-Puri
38. Dukhiyam Balarsingh, aged about 39 yrs., S/o. Sanatan Baliarsingh, a resident of Vill-Jamuna, PO-Aragul, Dist-Puri
39. Pramod Kumar Mangaraj, aged about 41 yrs., S/o. Kailash Mangaraj, a resident of Vill/PO-Ghoradia, Dist-Puri
40. Sarat Martha, aged about 40 yrs., S/o. Benudhar Martha a resident of Vill-Jamuna, PO-Aragul, Dist-Puri
41. Rabinaka Kumar Jena, aged about 39 yrs., S/o. late Natabar Jena, a resident of Balol, PO-Mtari, Dist-Puri

All are Registered Substitutes under Divisional Superintendent and Divisional Personnel Officer, Khurda Road, South Eastern Railway/East Coast Railway, Khurda Road Division, Jatni, Dist-Khurda

... Applicants

By the Advocates

M/s. Biswajit Mohanty
S. Patra

-Versus-

20

- 7 -

1. Union of India represented through General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach, Calcutta, West Bengal
2. Divisional Railway Manager (P), Khurda Road, South Eastern Railways, Jatni, Dist. Khurda
3. Divisional Railway Manager, Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railway, Jatni, Dist. Khurda
4. Divisional Transport Inspector (C), Khurda Road Division, South Eastern Railways, Jatni, Khurda

... Respondents

By the Advocates

Mr. D. N. Mishra
Mr. B. Pal

O.A. NO. 550/2000

1. Baijuntha Mohapatra, aged about 42 yrs., S/o. Abhimanyu Mohapatra, At-Amalanga, PO-Delanga, Dist. Puri
2. Pragalad Behera, aged about 43 yrs., S/o. Balaram Behera, At/Gopinathpur, PO-Jatni, Dist. Khurda

... Applicants

By the Advocates

Mr. B. Dash

-Versus-

1. Union of India represented through General Manager, S.E. Railway, Garden Reach, Calcutta-43
2. Divisional Railway Manager, S.E. Railway, Khurda Road Division, Jatni, Dist. Khurda
3. Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, S.E. Railway, Khurda Road Division, Jatni, Dist. Khurda
4. Station Superintendent of S.E. Railway, Khurda Road, Jatni, Dist. Khurda
5. Divisional Operating Superintendent, Khurda Road Division, S.E. Rly., Jatni, Dist. Khurda

... Respondents

By the Advocates

Mr. A. K. Misra
Mr. A. Pal
Mr. B. Pal
Mr. C. R. Mishra

.....

3

O R D E R

29 |
MR. B. N. SOI VICE-CHAIRMAN : In all the four Original Applications the point to be decided by us being one and the same, this common order will govern the field. For the sake of convenience, we may as well deal with O.A.454/97.

2. Purna Chandra Parida and 16 others have filed O.A. 454/97 seeking direction to Respondents/Railways for engagement as substitutes against day to day casualities/ vacancies, inter alia alleging the inaction of the Respondents in engaging them as substitutes although their juniors/ freshers have been engaged as such. The applicants claiming to be the registered substitutes of the year 1971-72 under Divisional Superintendent, S.E. Railway, Khurda Road have also assailed this action of the Respondents as illegal, arbitrary, mala fide, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

3. The applicants, as stated earlier, have claimed that they were registered by the Respondents as substitutes on various dates between November, 1971 to March, 1972. They have further claimed that their names were recorded in the register maintained in the office of Respondent No.3. They have submitted under Annexure-A/1 (said to be a sample copy of the orders) showing their registration as substitutes. They have also indicated the stations of engagement as substitute by the Respondents. The applicants have further alleged that by ignoring the entire procedure, the Respondents have absorbed some

22

outsiders as substitutes and they have also cited names of certain substitutes who are claimed to be junior to them against permanent posts. In spite of the direction of the Divisional Personnel Officer, S.E. Railway, Garden Reach vide his letter dated 10.10.79 that engagement of substitutes should be made strictly on the basis of seniority, the Respondents followed the policy of pick and choose and thus denied opportunity to the applicants for being regularly engaged. They have further stated that it was in the last part of 1996 that the applicants came to know that the authorities had started engaging freshers as substitutes. The applicant further stated that although there existed requirement of substitutes in the posts of token porter, time points man, lever man and gate man, the Respondents did not call them to duty. Thus being aggrieved, they have approached this Tribunal seeking direction to Respondents as referred to earlier.

4. Respondents, in their counter have refuted all the claims of the applicants to which the applicants have filed rejoinder and Respondents have also submitted reply to rejoinder. Applicants have also furnished additional verification enclosing thereto certain documents regarding engagement of some of them by the Respondents during 1977-81.

5. We have heard the learned counsels for both the sides and perused the materials available on record. Respondents have raised the question of limitation by stating that the cause of action having been arisen in

23
the year 1971-72 and this Original Application having
been filed ^{after,} 25 years/ i.e. in the year 1997, the same
is liable to be dismissed on the ground of limitation
alone. They have laid stress on the point that the
applicants at the time of their registration as substitutes,
as claimed by them, were in the age group of 10 - 16 years.
The applicants being minor on the ^{date of} purported application
were not *jure juris* and as such not entitled for registration
as substitutes. They have formally denied that the
applicants were ever registered as substitutes in 1971-72.
The Respondents have also denied the existence of any
document ^{the} like/one submitted by the applicants under
Annexure- /1. They have further pointed out that the case
of the applicants is contradictory, because, while they
are claiming to have been registered substitutes, in the
prayer they have asked for engagement against day to day
casualties/vacancies. They have also averred that even
if the applicants were ever engaged as substitutes, the
very fact that they do not claim any engagement between
the period 1980-81 and 1997 make them ineligible for
being considered for engagement as substitutes in terms
of Establishment Sl. No.244/84 (under the Heading
Screening) which stipulates as follows :

"If a casual labour who was earlier discharged
from service on completion of work or for
want of further productive work has not worked
on the Railways again in the preceding two
calendar years his name should be struck off
from the casual labour register".

The Respondents have also denied the allegation
that any person viz. Chandra Sekhar Barik, T.N.Pradhan and

24
Nakul Bari were ever working as substitutes under Chief D.T.I., Khurda. Repudiating the chart showing stations of engagement of the applicants, the Respondents have stated that the same cannot be dependent upon, because, it does not disclose the length of engagement and/or days' of engagement of the applicants, thus making it difficult for verification. The Respondents have, by filing a reply, denied that the certificates of enrolment of the applicants during the same period between 1977-1981 are not authentic being not accompanied with engagement letters enrolling the applicants as substitutes issued by the Divisional Personnel Officer and that on verification of records no such engagement letters were found to have been issued by the Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer. The Respondents have further stated that the substitute register maintained by the Khurda Road Division shows that the applicants were never engaged as substitutes nor were they paid any wages nor their names were taken forward in the substitute register that after 10.10.1979, the engagement of substitutes was done at the Division level with the approval of General Manager etc. For the engagement done prior to that date by the Division only wages were paid through station pay order, signed by the divisional authority and therefore, the Respondents submitted that had the applicants been engaged as substitutes their names should have been reflected in the substitute register.

6. The issue which needs to be resolved here is to determine whether the applicants are entitled to relief that they have claimed and as to whether they

23

were registered as substitutes by the Respondents during the year 1977. The story of the applicants is that they were registered during the year 1971-72, but were given engagement during the period 1977-81. Although to prove their point the applicants have relied on the strength of the letter of the Respondents at Annexure-A/1 as well as certificates of engagement under Annexure-A/4, the Respondents have repudiated the authenticity of both these documents. With regard to Annexure-A/1, they have denied the existence of any office file bearing Index No. "P-3/1-A". Further they have stated that even for the argument's sake this letter did exist, it could not have helped the applicants for registering themselves as substitutes, because the letter contained an instruction that the Selection Board could appoint a candidate provided he was in the age limit between 18 & 25 years. As the applicants, during the year 1971-72 are found to be within the group of 10-16 years, they could not have been registered as substitutes. As regards Annexure-A/4 the Respondents have disputed the authenticity of this document for the reason they have explained in the counter.

2

7. A few questions arose out of this application which have not been answered satisfactorily by the applicants, i.e., whether the Respondents could have registered some workers 7 to 8 years earlier for engagement and whether administratively it was feasible to maintain such list for years together and if the

24

applicants were actually engaged as substitutes sometimes in 1977, 1978, 1980 and 1981, according to their own admission, why they were not engaged till 1997, when they approached this Tribunal in the present O.A. They had for inexplicable reasons remained dormant all these years. As a result having not been engaged for so many years they could not have retained their status as substitutes in terms of Estt. L. No.244/84 dated 12.12.1984. Thus this point remains incontrovertible. And having remained silent for so many years they are liable to lose their right to agitate the matter. It has been brought to our notice by the Respondents that similar issue came up before this Tribunal in O.A.341/98. In that case, applicants (15 in number) claimed to have worked as substitutes on different dates in 1978 at Gurudhhatia Railway Station and produced certificates of engagement from the Station Master. Thereafter neither they were engaged nor did they agitate. The Tribunal found that the period of engagement during 1978-79 was 3 to 20 days, but they approached the Tribunal 21 years after the last engagement under the Railways. The applicants could not clarify as to why they had remained silent for the last 21 years. Neither they had indicated if they had ever preferred any representation to the departmental authorities during the intervening period praying that they should be reengaged. Having regard to these facts of the case, the Tribunal held that the applicants were not entitled to get engagement under the Respondents.

8. In the instant case also the period of engagement

(notwithstanding that the certificates produced by the applicants the authenticity of which is in doubt) of the applicants were very short and that for over decade and a half they remained out of sight in the matter. It is because of the efflux of time the relevant documents/ registers became unavailable with the Respondents. The latter have, however, brought before us the register of substitutes that they are maintaining since 1997 in a bound form and for the earlier period, the documents are maintained in respective files. But the registers for the years from 1970 to 1980 were not available for good reasons. This inordinate delay in ventilating the grievance stares at the applicants and the same is incurable. Onus lies on the applicants to prove with reference to official documents in their possession the fact of their registration, to produce certificates of enrolment and to offer explanations for remaining silent for over 16 to 19 years. But they had failed to comply with these requirements of the case.

9. In view of the preceeding discussions, we are of the view that the applicants in O.A.454/97 as well as in other three OAs have not been able to make out a case for any of the reliefs prayed for. Accordingly, the the four Original Applications fail. No costs.

(M
ME

Sd/- M.R. CHANTY
MEMBER-JUD

Sd/- B.N. SOM
VICE-CHAIRMAN

By