

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 56 of 1995

Tuesday, this the 8th day of August, 1995

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR PV VENKATAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE MR P SURYAPRAKASAM, JUDICIAL MEMBER.

1. Joice Mathew, D/o KE Mathew,
Casual Lower Division Clerk,
Regional Passport Office, Kochi-36
Kulangara House, Karayamparambu,
Karukutty PO.
2. Hila Hentry, W/o George,
Casual Lower Division Clerk,
Regional Passport Office, Kochi-36
Thayyil House, Kochi-25
3. PA Preetha, W/o Nandakumar,
Casual Lower Division Clerk,
Regional Passport Office, Kochi-36
Ananda Bhavan, Alwaye-5.
4. KJ Beena, W/o Radhakrishnan,
Casual Lower Division Clerk,
Regional Passport Office, Kochi-36
Kesava Nivas, Vytila, Kochi-19. .. Applicants

By Advocate Mr. MR Rajendran Nair

Vs.

1. Union of India represented by
Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi.
2. The Regional Passport Officer,
Ernakulam. .. Respondents

By Advocate Mr. Varghese P Thomas, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 8th August, 1995
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

PV VENKATAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Applicants are Casual Labourers working in the Regional
Passport Office, Kochi. They pray that their services should
not be terminated for the purpose of providing others employ-
ment on casual basis and for a direction to respondents to
allow the applicants to continue in service on casual basis

till their services are regularised.

2. Learned Counsel for applicants submits that subsequent to filing this application the services of applicants were, in fact, terminated. In view of this, the application becomes infructuous.

3. Learned Counsel for applicants submits that the third applicant has passed an examination conducted on behalf of the Department by the Staff Selection Commission, but the other applicants have not qualified. He would submit that he may be permitted to make a representation on behalf of all these applicants with a request to consider their cases for re-engagement/regularisation.

4. Respondents have stated that as far as reengagement is concerned, they are going strictly by the orders of the Tribunal in OA 2034/93 and connected cases. Learned Counsel for applicants would contend that these applicants were not applicants in those cases. Nevertheless, since the scheme agreed upon in that Original Application was of a general nature laying down the procedure for re-engaging casual labourers on the basis of their length of service, we find no reason to give any direction in this regard to the respondents. Applicants, however, are permitted to make a representation to the first respondent, if they have any grievance in this regard, within one month from today. If such a representation is made, the first respondent will consider it and dispose it of within four months of the date of its receipt.

5. The application is disposed of as aforesaid. No costs.

Dated the 8th August, 1995


P. SURYAPRAKASAM
JUDICIAL MEMBER


P. VENKATAKRISHNAN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER