

Tribunal by a judgement dated 21.6.1990 had disposed of the said O.A. directing the applicants therein to make xxxxxxxxx representations to the 2nd respondent, with supporting evidence of their casual engagement and further directing the respondents to take action on the representation in the light of the judgement in Inderpal Yadav's case reported in (1985) 2 SCC 648. Accordingly, the applicants had made detailed representations to the ^{second} respondent and as a result of this, the 2nd respondent granted the applicant temporary status entitling him to appropriate placing in the live casual service register.

2. He ^{was} further stated that about 400 casual labourers who had not put in as many days service as the applicant therein had been reengaged by the 2nd respondent. The applicant had, therefore, made a further representation dated 5.12.1998, but there is no response from the respondents.

3. When the O.A. was taken up, learned counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that it is suffice to direct the 2nd respondent to consider the representation made by the applicant and to give him an appropriate reply within a reasonable time.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that there is no objection in adopting such a course.

5. In the light of the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of

Tribunal by a judgement dated 21.6.1990 had disposed of the said O.A. directing the applicants therein to make xxxxxxxxx representations to the 2nd respondent, with supporting evidence of their casual engagement and further directing the respondents to take action on the representation in the light of the judgement in Inderpal Yadav's case reported in (1985) 2 SCC 648. Accordingly, the applicants had made detailed representations to the ^{second} respondent and as a result of this, the 2nd respondent granted the applicant temporary status entitling him to appropriate placing in the live casual service register.

2. He ^{was} further stated that about 400 casual labourers who had not put in as many days service as the applicant therein had been reengaged by the 2nd respondent. The applicant had, therefore, made a further representation dated 5.12.1998, but there is no response from the respondents.

3. When the O.A. was taken up, learned counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that it is suffice to direct the 2nd respondent to consider the representation made by the applicant and to give him an appropriate reply within a reasonable time.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that there is no objection in adopting such a course.

5. In the light of the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of

-3-

directing the 2nd respondent to consider the representation made by the applicant dated 5.12.98 and to give him an appropriate reply within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Dated the 18th February 2000.

JL Negi
J.L. NEGI
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

rv