

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY, 1987

Present: Hon'ble Shri Ch.Ramakrishna Rao Member(J)

Hon 'ble Shri L.H.A.Rego Member(A)

APPLICATION No. 1645/86(F)

Tamil Arasan V.M.
R/o No.430, 7th Cross,
Old Bagalur lay out,
Corporation Colony,
Near Lingarajapuram,
Bangalore - 560 084.

... Applicant.

Vs.

1. The Director,
L.R.D.E., Byrasandra,
Bangalore.

2. The Union of India
Represented by the
Scientific Adviser to
Raksha Minister, South Block,
New Delhi - 11.

... Respondents.

(Shri M.S.Padmarajaiah ... Advocate)

This application has come up before the court today.

Hon'ble Shri Ch.Ramakrishna Rao, Member(J) made the following :

ORDER

In this application, the applicant, who was working as a Salesman in LRDE, Bangalore, since 1977, prays that the Director, LRDE, Bangalore, be directed to regularise his services in the appropriate scale.

2. Shri M.S.Padmarajaiah, Sr.C.G.S.C., appearing for the respondents, submits that the applicant is working as a Salesman in a canteen set up under section 46 of the Factories Act, 1948, with which the LRDE has no direct link, and as such, no relief can be granted to the applicant.





3. Shri R.Balaguru, learned counsel for the applicant, invites our attention to the letter dated 21.9.1982 of the Ministry of Defence (Annexure-A) in which it is stated that the employees of canteens established in defence industrial installations under section 46 of the Factories Act, 1948, should be treated on par with Government employees w.e.f. 22.10.1980, and no action has been taken by the respondents as envisaged by the aforesaid letter.

4. The language of the letter at Annexure-A supports the submission of Shri Balaguru. We, therefore, direct the Director, LRDE, Bangalore, to consider the case of the applicant with reference to the letter at Annexure-A and pass appropriate orders within 2 months from the date of receipt of this order.

5. If the applicant is aggrieved by the order to be passed by the Director, he is at liberty to move this Tribunal.

6. In the result, the application is disposed of, subject to the direction given above.


MEMBER(J)


MEMBER(AM)(R) 7-1-87
L

AN.

~~62~~ 62

94	A.No. 1814/86(T) (WP No. 10183/82)	A. Maniswar	9-1-87	Disposed of (C) issued on 6/2/87
95	A.No. 782/86(T) (WP No. 3469/81)	S.P. Navasimhela	-do-	Disposed of (C) issued on 6/2/87
96	A.No. 1494/86(T) (WP No. 12083/85)	C.R. Madhavanurthy	12-1-87	Dismissed (C) issued on 9/2/87
	A.No. 1890/86(T) (WP No. 45/84)		15-1-87	Disposed of (C)
97	A.No. 1397/86(T) (WP No. 2616/84)	H. Raghunatha Rao	16-1-87	Allowed (C) (issued on 13/2/87)
98	A.No. 1425/86(T) (WP No. 3124/85)	H.B. Bora Nalla	19-1-87	Disposed of (C) issued on 9/2/87
99	A.No. 316/86(T) (WP No. 20097/80)		20-1-87	Dismissed (C)
100	A.No. 1379/86(T) (WP No. 4024/84)	N.C. Goundaiah	21-1-87	Dismissed (C) (issued on 6/2/87)
101	A.No. 1424/86(T) (WP No. 3197/85)	Chandrasekhar Pathur	22-1-87	Disposed of (C) (issued on 12/2/87)
102	A.No. 1642/86(A) (V. Venkatachela)		-do-	Dismissed (C) issued on 13/2/87
103	R.A.No. 10/87 (A.No. 330/86(T))		-do-	Dismissed (C)