

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CALCUTTA BENCH

O.A. No. 166 of 1997

Date of order: 02.05.2000

Present : Hon'ble Mr. D. Purkayastha, Judicial Member

Hon'ble Mr. G. S. Maingi, Administrative Member

Mamata Bakshi (Mamatarani Bakhi), W/o Sri K. G. Bakshi working as Health Visitor in E. Rly. Hospital; Asansol, C/o Sri N.G. Ghosh, No.1, Mohisilla Govt. Colony, Plot No.266, P.O. Mohisilla-713 303, Dist. Burdwan

... Applicant

VS

1. Union of India, thr. the General Manager, E. Rly., 17 N.S. ROAD, Calcutta-700 001

2. The Divisional Railway Manager, E. Rly., Asansol

... Respondents

For the Applicant : Mr. B. Chatterjee, counsel

For the Respondents : Mr. R. K. De, counsel

O R D E R


D. Purkayastha, JM

Applicant, Smt. Mamata Bakshi earlier filed one application bearing No. OA 382/91 before this Tribunal seeking protection from reversion from the post of Health Visitor to the post of Medical Attendant (Ayah) and the Tribunal passed the judgment on 2.2.94 protecting her right from the alleged threat of reversion from the post of Health Visitor to the post of Medical Attendant (Ayah). In the said judgment a specific direction was given to the authority that the applicant was not to be reverted from the post of Health Visitor until the post is filled up by a regular appointee. After the judgment the applicant made a representation to the authority claiming regularisation in the post of Health Visitor since she had been working in the said post for more than 10 years.

2. We have heard the submissions of the learned counsel of both the parties and have gone through the judgment passed on 2.2.94, Annexure 'A/1' to the application and we find that the applicant's right has been protected by the said judgment. Now the

said judgment. It is stated by the respondents that no action has been taken by the respondents for the purpose of regularisation in the post of Health Visitor. The applicant made a representation for consideration of her case for regularisation. On a query Mr. De, learned advocate for the respondents submits that no decision has been taken by the authorities in this regard.

3. In view of the aforesaid circumstances we direct the respondents to consider the representation of the applicant in the light of the judgment passed earlier and to dispose of the said representation with a speaking and reasoned order within two months from the date of communication of this order. Accordingly, the application is disposed of awarding no cost.

  
(G. S. Maingi)

MEMBER (A)

  
(D. Purkayastha)

MEMBER (J)