

25

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.NO. 868/92

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 6-6-95

BETWEEN:

S. Nagender : Applicant

and.

1. The Director
Doordarshan Kendra
Ramanthapur
Hyderabad

2. The Director General
Doordarshan Kendra
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg
New Delhi

3. The Union of India
rep. by its Secretary
Min. of Information & Broadcasting
New Delhi : Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: SHRI V. Ajay Kumar, Advocate

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI N.V. Ramana
Sr./Addl.CGSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI, MEMBER (ADMN.)

CONTD....

26

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, Vice Chairman)

Heard Sri V. Ajay Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.V. Ramana, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA was filed praying for direction to the respondents to regularise the service of the applicant in the category of Production Assistant with effect from 14-8-1992 with all consequential benefits.

3. The applicant was initially appointed as Casual General Assistant in Doordarshan Kendra, Hyderabad, on 24-11-1988. He worked in the said cadre in various spells after February, 1991. He was appointed as Casual Production Assistant on 20-2-1991 and he worked for 30 days in different spells upto 25-9-1991.

4. The Casual Artists of Doordarshan Kendra made representation to the Management to regularise their service. When their demand in regard to the same was not acceded to, they approached the Principal Bench and some other Benches of CAT. The Principal Bench suggested a scheme for regularisation. It lays down interalia that weightage of one year for each calendar year has to be given if the casual artists ~~who~~ worked for not less than 120 days in a calendar year, and if on that basis a casual artiste is within the maximum age stipulated by 9-6-1992, his services has to be regularised.

5. Another condition that ~~has to be~~ ^{was} stipulated that the Casual Artist should have worked for 120 days in atleast one of the relevant calendar years.

6. Ultimately in pursuance of the suggestion of the Principal Bench Scheme for regularisation of the services

✓

To

1. The Director, Doordarshan Kendra,
Ramantapur, Hyderabad.
2. The Director General, Doordarshan Kendra,
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.
3. The Secretary, Union of India,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
New Delhi.
4. One copy to Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Advocate, 5-9-22/14,
Adarshanagar, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

(27)

of the Casual Artists of Doordarshan was evolved as per OM dated 9-6-1992.

7. The applicant had not worked for 120 days in any of the calendar years. He worked for 120 days only in 1989. It is pleaded for the applicant that but for the violation of the directions of the Central Government and Director General, ~~by R-1~~, he would have worked for more days in a calendar year and he would have come within the purview of the regularisation scheme and he should not be deprived of that benefit for the lapse on the part of R-1 and hence his services have to be regularised.

8. It is now stated for the respondents that revised guidelines as per No.2(3)/86-SI dated 17-3-1994 ~~was~~ issued for regularisation of the Casual Artists in Doordarshan Kendras, and the case of the applicant was considered on the basis of the above revised guidelines and his name was included in the panel of eligible Casual Artists to be regularised in future vacancies.

(Learned standing counsel for the respondents submitted that the above submission is made in pursuance of letter No.TVH/21/34/92/Adm/7627 dated 11-10-1994).

9. As it is now stated for the respondents that the services of the applicant in the post of General Assistant will be regularised in future vacancies as and when his turn arises, no other order has to be passed in this OA. Accordingly it is closed. No costs./

Sd/-
HABG
M(A)

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY
Date.....
Court Officer
Central Administrative Tribunal
Hyderabad Bench
Hyderabad

Sd/-
HVNR5
VC.

To

1. The Director, Doordarshan Kendra, Ramantapur, Hyderabad.
2. The Director General, Doordarshan Kendra, Mandi House, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.
3. The Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, New Delhi.
4. One copy to Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Advocate, 5-9-22/14, Adarshanagar, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

of the Casual Artists of Doordarshan was evolved as per OM dated 9-6-1992.

Q. The applicant had not worked for 120 days in any of the calendar years. He worked for ~~120~~¹¹⁷ days only in 1989. It is pleaded for the applicant that but for the violation of the directions of the Central Government and Director General, ~~by R-1~~, he would have worked for more days in a calendar year and he would have come within the purview of the regularisation scheme and he should not be deprived of that benefit for the lapse on the part of R-1 and hence his services have to be regularised.

Q. It is now stated for the respondents that revised guidelines as per No.2(3)/86-~~81~~ dated 17-3-1994 ~~was~~ issued for regularisation of the Casual Artists in Doordarshan Kendras, and the case of the applicant was considered on the basis of the above revised guidelines and his name was included in the panel of eligible Casual Artists to be regularised in future vacancies.

(Learned standing counsel for the respondents submitted that the above submission is made in pursuance of letter No.TVH/21/34/92/Adm/7627 dated 11-10-1994).

Q. As it is now stated for the respondents that the services of the applicant in the post of General Assistant will be regularised in future vacancies as and when his turn arises, no other order has to be passed in this OA. Accordingly it is closed. No costs. /

thank you
(A.B. Gorthi)
Member (Admn)

Neeladri
(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated : June 6, 95
Dictated in Open Court

sk

*Amulya
1995-
Deputy Registrar (DCC)*

THPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

A B Gorathi

THE HON'BLE MR. ~~REPRESENTATIVE~~ (M(ADMN))

DATED --- 6/6 --- 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

in
OA. No.

868/92

TA. No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

closed

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

No Space (copy)

