

Central Administrative Tribunal, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow
M.P. No.193/2004 in O.A.No. ~~193/2004~~ /2004 ^h

this the 14th day of May, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI S.P. ARYA, MEMBER (A)

IN RE: SRI S.P. ARYA, MEMBER (A)

1. Somaru aged about 40 years son of Sukkhoo
2. Nirmal aged about 41 years son of Dashrath
3. Bisheshar aged about 42 years son of Munna Ram
4. Bahadur aged about 43 years son of Ganesh
- . Ram Bali aged about 44 years son of Bindra.
6. Har Govind aged about 45 years son of Bahal
7. Ram Nath aged about 40 years son of Baddal
8. Ram Das aged about 41 years son of Gaddar
9. Ram Moorat aged about 42 years son of Kuber

...Applicants

...Applicants

;By Advocate: Sri G.P.Tripathi

Versus

1. Union of India through Sansad Sachivalaya, North Block, Secreary Railway, new Delhi.
2. Divisional Superintending Engineer (Coordinator) Norther Railway (DRM Office), Lucknow.
4. PWI Northern Railway, Bhadohi.
4. AEN, Northern Railway, Pratapgarh.

...Opposite Parties.

By Advocate: Sri N.K.Agrawal-

ORDER

BY SHRI S.P. ARYA, MEMBER (A)

This application has been filed by Somaru and 8 others for directing the opposite parties to regularise the services of the applicants.

2. M.P. for seeking permission to file joint prosecution along with application was heard at the admission stage.

3. It is stated by the counsel for applicant that they have worked for 25 years as Gangman. They had made representations on 22.11.2003 and 4.11.2003. No period as such have been shown when they had

✓

worked. The representation also do not show the dates of engagements and disengagements.

4. Upon hearing the counsel for the parties and perusal of the application, it is found that no prima facie case as such is made ^{out} by the applicants. The period they have worked and the date on which they were disengaged has not been indicated. No ^{evidence} ~~time~~ has been submitted in support of the working. The question of limitation cannot ^{be} gone into because the application does not make out any relevant date as such.

5. In the circumstances stated above, M.P. and application deserves to be dismissed. It is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(S.P. ARYA)

24/3/12
(S.P. ARYA)
MEMBER (A)

HLS|!