

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PATNA BENCH, PATNA

O.A. No. 799 of 05

Date of order : 16.1.09

C O R A M  
Hon'ble Ms. Sadhna Srivastava, Member ( J )

Himanshu ..... Applicant  
Vs.  
Union of India and Others ..... Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : Shri G. Bose  
Counsel for the respondents : Shri A.R. Pandey

ORDER

S. Srivastava, M ( J ):- The applicant claims a direction upon the respondents to re-engage him and regularize his services on the post of Graphic Artist.

2. The facts are that the applicant was appointed on 06.02.91 as casual Graphic Artist. He worked intermittently till 01.01.2003. Meanwhile, Doordarshan Directorate introduced a regularization scheme dated 09.06.92 pursuant to and on the basis of order passed by the Principal bench of the Tribunal in OA No. 563 of 86 – Anil Kumar Mathur vs. UOI & Others. The said regularization scheme was partially modified by OM dated 17.3.94. Under this scheme, the applicant was admittedly short-listed after screening and put in the panel for eventual regularization as Graphic Artist in Doordarshan Patna. The

7B

empanelment of the applicant was made on the ground that he has completed 120 days of service prior to a cut-off date. However, he has not been regularized for want of vacancy in Doordarshan Kendra Patna. The applicant knows it. He had earlier filed OA[s] No. 139 of 98 and OA 477 of 03. The decisions were in his favour in so far as a direction was made to consider him for regularization as and when a vacancy arises in Doordarshan Kendra Patna. Even a letter has been issued to the applicant to this effect by the respondents. The letter is on record as Annexure A/10. This letter clearly mentions that a person who is in the eligibility panel of one Kendra has no right to claim regularization in another Kendra vide Clause No. 4 of Regularization Scheme dated 09.06.92. The request of the applicant for direction to the respondents to re-engage him has not been accepted by the two Division Benches of this Tribunal in the aforesaid OA[s].

3. In the above circumstances, this Tribunal does not consider that any other relief can be granted to the applicant. He will have to wait for his turn. The OA is, accordingly disposed of. No order as to the costs.



[Sadhna Srivastava] M [J]

/cbs/