

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH 'GULESTAN' BUILDING NO. 55
PRESCOT ROAD, MUMBAI:1

Original Application No. 910/93 and 210/97

Thursday the 1st day of July 1999.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.Venkatarakan, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri S.K. Ghosal, Member (A)

Munshiram Dharmuram Jaiswar
Watchman, Security,
B.A.R.C. Bombay.

... Applicant in
OA 910/93.

1. M.K. Wagadhari
2. S.R. Dalvi.
3. B.L.Ghag.
4. R.S. Kamble
5. A.V. Baban.
6. P.S.Daware.
7. S.D. Shreshta.
8. A.S. Dhragange
9. L.D. Thakur.
10. S.L. Singh
11. S.K. Gawade.
12. R.S.Sharma.
13. P.T. Pyrall.
14. R.B. Tiwari.
15. A.Y. Shinde.
16. D.L. Patil.
17. T.T.Wakode.
18. A.S. Komar.
19. K.R. Gupta.
20. A.S.Rawat.
21. L.S.B. Singh.

22. S.J. Tiwari.
23. V.B. Musande.
24. S.N. Lal.
25. L.B. Dubey.
26. Sher Singh.
27. K.J. Singh.
28. P. Mandiram.
29. Badri Ram.
30. K.M. Pathak.
31. Bharat Singh.
32. A.R. Kadam.
33. G.G. Prachetya.
34. Chatiar Singh.
35. D.J. Gangurde.
36. H.R. Pant.
37. J.S. Mishra.
38. S. Hiranand.
39. D.B. Uniyal.
40. G.N. Mehra.
41. B.R. Bhosale.
42. B.H. More.
43. M.D. Kharche.
44. B.B. Raul.
45. M. Allatan.
46. S.M. Pathak.
47. R.D. Bansode.
48. B.P. Pande.
49. C.Y. Salvi.
50. R.S. Tiwari.
51. K.W. Bhosle.

52. V.G. Kamble.
53. J.G. Golsalkar.
54. J.P.S. Gond.
55. M.S. Rawat.
56. A.G. Ubale.
57. K.D. Gaikwad.
58. P.B. Surve.
59. S.K. Komar.
60. S.D. Giri.
61. S.Sharma.
62. G.R. Jadhav.
63. O.P. Singh.
64. S.Sheikh.
65. V.D. Mishra.

All are presently working as Head Watchman
in BARC.

C/o Shri Suresh Kumar,
Advocate, Flat No.51,
Bldg. No.4, Sardar Nagar, No.4.
Sion Koliwada, Mumbai.

... Applicants in
O.A. 210/97.

By Advocate Shri Suresh Kumar.

V/s.

1. Union of India through
The Secretary,
Department of Atomic Energy
Anushakti Bhavan, C.S.M. Marg.,
Bombay.
2. The Controller,
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre,
Central Complex, Trombay.
Bombay.
3. The Personnel Officer,
Recruitment Section II
Central Complex, Trombay.
Bombay.

... Respondents.

By Shri J.P. Deodhar.

O R D E R (ORAL)

| Per Shri Justice S.Venkataraman, Vice Chairman |

The applicants who are Watchmen wants a direction to the respondents to frame promotional rules to provide promotion to Watchmen on the ground that no promotion avenue is provided even though in other cadre, there are promotion avenue.

2. It is ^{Conceded} considered by both sides that, new scheme has been formulated in 1998 providing promotional avenue even to the Watchman. As such these applications has become infructuous. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that even in the new scheme there are some anomalies. The applicant who secure initial promotion would not get such benefit. We cannot go into that question in these applications. However if the applicants have any genuine grievance they may give representation to the respondents who may consider the same and pass appropriate orders within a period of six months from the date of representation. All other contentions raised by both counsel are left open. No costs. ~~Particular Application~~
~~disposed of as infructuous~~

(S.K. Ghosal)
Member (A)

NS

(S.Venkataraman)
Vice Chairman