

(11)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.
O.A.No.1121/92 Date of order: 10.1.1997

Smt.Sapna Mahesh, 4-K-42, Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur.

...Applicant.

VS

1. Union of India through Secretary, Deptt. of Information and Broadcasting, New Delhi.
2. Director General, Doordarshan, New Delhi.
3. Director, Doordarshan, Jaipur Kendra, Jaipur.

...Respondents.

Mr.R.N.Mathur : Counsel for applicant

Mr.U.D.Sharma : Counsel for respondents.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr.O.P.Sharma, Administrative Member

Hon'ble Mr.Ratan Prakash, Judicial Member

PER HON'BLE MR.O.P.SHARMA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER.

In this application under Sec.19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, Smt.Sapna Mahesh has prayed that the scheme of regularisation of casual Artists prepared by the respondents - Govt of India and Doordarshan - which provides that only those employees shall be regularised who have rendered 120 days service in a year may be quashed and the respondents may be directed to regularise the services of the applicant and that she shall be treated as permanent employee of the respondents.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material on record.

3. The applicant was working as a Casual Production Assistant in Doordarshan Kendra, Jaipur. The respondents have formulated a scheme dated 9.6.92, regarding regularisation of casual Artists working in Doordarshan. One of the requirements of the scheme is that those employees who have worked for a minimum of 120 days a year can be regularised. Since the

(11)

(12)

respondents held that the applicant did not fulfil this requirement, she was not included in the panel of employees who were to be regularised in accordance with the scheme dated 9.6.92. Hence, the applicant has sought quashing of the said scheme which does not entitle her to regularisation.

4. During the arguments, the learned counsel for the respondents has brought to our notice that a further liberalised scheme for regularisation of casual Artists was formulated by the respondents and issued vide O.M dated 17.3.94. A copy of the said scheme was produced during the arguments and an extract of the same has been taken on record. In view of this scheme, the applicant was included in the further panel prepared for regularisation of casual Artists in the category of Production Assistant. From the copy of the said further panel produced before us during the arguments, it is seen that the applicant's name figures at Sl.No.26 thereof. The applicant would be eligible for being considered for regularisation in accordance with her turn in the said panel.

5. In view of the above position, it is not necessary for us to consider the other prayers in the O.A. The O.A stands disposed of with no order as to costs.



(Ratan Prakash)

Judicial Member.



(O.P. Sharma)

Administrative Member.