

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 521 of 2000

Tuesday, this the 23rd day of May, 2000

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. G. RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. James Peter,
Ponthamala House,
Kuttoor, Kaviyoor,
Thiruvalla.Applicant

By Advocate Mr. M.V.S. Nampoothiry

Versus

1. Union of India represented by the
Secretary, Department of Science and
Technology, Central Secretariat, New Delhi.

2. The Chairman,
Indian Space Research Organization,
Bangalore.

3. The Director,
Vikram Sarabai Space Centre,
Thiruvananthapuram.

4. The Administrative Officer, Recruitment,
Vikram Sarabai Space Centre,
Thiruvananthapuram.

5. Central Electronics Charitable Society for
Physically Handicapped, Reg.No. 299/88,
Ayroor, Varkala, represented by its
President.Respondents

The application having been heard on 23rd May, 2000,
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant who claims to have been engaged through a
contractor to perform some work for the Vikram Sarabai Space
Centre has filed this application for a direction to respondents
1 to 4 to regularise the service of the applicant. It has been

alleged in the application that the applicant having been undergone apprenticeship is entitled to get preference while making appointments.

2. On a careful perusal of the application and the materials and on hearing the counsel, we do not find any subsisting or legitimate cause of action of the applicant for redressal. Just for the reason that the applicant had been under a contractor performing certain work for the Vikram Sarabai Space Centre, he does not acquire any right for regularisation as there was no privity of contract of employment between him and the respondents. The ruling reported in U.P. State Road Transport Corporation and Another Vs. U.P. Parivahan Nigam Shishukhs Berozgar Sangh and Others [(1995) 2 SCC 1] also does not advance the case of the applicant for regularisation. If there is a vacancy and if recruitment is being made, the applicant may be entitled for consideration on the basis of his qualification and experience. However, the applicant is not entitled to the reliefs as prayed for in this application.

3. Accordingly, we dismiss the application in limine. No costs.

Tuesday, this the 23rd day of May, 2000



G. RAMAKRISHNAN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

ak.



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN