

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 1300/92

199

T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION 21/4/95

Kanhaiya Sadanand Lokhande Petitioner

Shri A.P. Raghute Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Government of India, Respondent

Ministry of Defense, Secretary, New Delhi &

General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Ambazari, Nagpur.

Shri R. P. Darda Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.S. Deshpande, Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. P.P. Srivastava, Member(A).

1. Whether ~~Reporters~~ of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *no*
3. Whether ~~their~~ Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? *no*

abp.

mbm*


(M.S. DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH CAMP AT NAGPUR.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:1300/92.

Kanhaiya Sadanand Lokhande

... Applicant

V/s.

1. Government of India,
Ministry of Defense, through
its Secretary, New Delhi.

2. General Manager,
Ordinance Factory, Ambazari,
Nagpur.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman.
Hon'ble Shri P.P.Srivastava, Member(A).

APPEARANCES:

Shri A.P.Raghute, Counsel
for Applicant.

Shri R.P.Darda, Counsel
for Respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT:

DATED : 21/4/95.

X Per Shri M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman. X

The applicant was offered work on casual basis on several occasions when he was sent by the Employment Exchange in response to the requisition by the Department for supply of Labour. The Applicant was not given work after 30/6/91 and he has approached the Tribunal to set aside the oral termination order which was passed by the Respondent-2 on 30/6/91. The respondents contention is that the applicant was not a regular worker but ^{was} employed ~~only on~~ daily wages and he has not put in the requisite number of days work to qualify him for continuous employment. The table of the periods ^{during} in which the applicant has worked has been ^{given} ~~stated~~ in the reply. On merits we do not see any right in the applicant to have the order of termination quashed.

However, we direct the respondents to give work to the applicant with them whenever work of casual nature becomes available for being allotted. With this direction, the OA is disposed of.

(P.P.SRIVASTAVA)
MEMBER(A)

(M.S.DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN