

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.12/2000

Thursday, this the 6th day of January, 2000.

CORAM:

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

HON'BLE MR J.L.NEGI, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

S.Attakoya,
S/o Pukoya,
Executive Engineer(Civil),
Lakshadweep,
P.W.D., Kalpeni.

- Applicant

By Advocate Mr M.R.Rajendran Nair

Vs

1. Union of India represented by
the Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi.
2. The Administrator,
Union Territory of Lakshadweep,
Kavarathi,
Lakshadweep P.W.D.
Circle Office Kavarathi.
3. The Superintending Engineer,
Lakshadweep, P.W.D.
P.W.D., Circle Office,
Kavarathi.

- Respondents

By Advocate Mr P.R.Ramachandra Menon, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 6.1.2000, 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 is now working as an Executive Engineer on ad hoc basis in the P.W.D. Circle, Kavaratty, had made a representation on 21.7.98 to the 3rd respondent

seeking his regularisation on the post and also to extend the ad hoc appointment, if there be any delay for regularisation. However, the ad hoc promotion of the applicant was extended and he is even now officiating as Executive Engineer. His grievance is that though there is a vacancy of Executive Engineer and he is qualified as per the recruitment rules for promotion, he is being continuing on ad hoc basis. The applicant has therefore has filed this application praying for a declaration that the service of the applicant as Executive Engineer is to be regularised and for a direction to the respondents to do so.

2. When the application came up for hearing, learned counsel on either side agreed that the application may be disposed of permitting the applicant to make a representation to the 2nd respondent projecting his grievance in regard to regularisation as Executive Engineer and with a direction to the 2nd respondent that if such a representation is received, the same shall be disposed of within a reasonable time.

3. In the light of the above submission by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of permitting the applicant to make a representation to the 2nd respondent projecting his grievance in regard to regularisation within two weeks from today and with a direction to the 2nd respondent that if such a representation is received within the said period, the same shall be considered in the light of the rules and instructions on the subject and an appropriate reply be

given to the applicant within two months from the date of receipt of the representation. No costs.

Dated, the 6th of January, 2000.



(J.L.NEGI)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



(A.V.HARIDASAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

trs/1212000