

3

**THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR  
ORDER SHEET**


APPLICATION NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant(s)

Respondent (s)

Advocate for Applicant (s)

Advocate for Respondent (s)

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY	ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL
	<p><b><u>08.10.2009</u></b></p> <p><b><u>OA No. 450/2009</u></b></p> <p><b>Mr. P.N. Jatti, Counsel for applicant.</b></p> <p><b>Heard learned counsel for the applicant.</b></p> <p><b>For the reasons dictated separately, the OA is disposed of.</b></p> <div> <b>(M.L. CHAUHAN)</b> <b>MEMBER (J)</b></div> <p><b>AHQ</b></p>

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH

Jaipur, this the 08<sup>th</sup> October, 2009

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 450/2009**

**CORAM:**

HON'BLE MR. M.L. CHAUHAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Mr. Murlidhar son of Ram Lal by caste Dhankar, aged about 25 years, resident of F-278, Lal Kothi Scheme, Jaipur. Presently working as Daily Wager in the office of the Chief Commissioner Income Tax, Revenue Building, Statue Circle, Jaipur.

.....APPLICANT

(By Advocate: Mr. P.N. Jatti)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi.
2. Chief Commissioner Income Tax, Central Revenue Building, Statue Circle, Jaipur.
3. Commissioner of Income Tax (Headquarter), Central Revenue Building, Bhagwan Das Road, Statue Circle, Jaipur.
4. Mr. Mahaveer Dass Bairagi, 6/10, Income Tax Colony, Jaipur.

.....RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: -----)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

The case of the applicant is that he is working with the Department for the last 2 ½ years on daily wage basis and continued to work in that capacity till 31.08.2009. The grievance of the applicant is now that the respondents have dis-engaged his service and in his place some other person has been engaged by Shri P.K. Sharma, Commissioner (Audit), which course was not permissible for the respondents. Thus the applicant has prayed that directions may be given to the respondents to re-engage him in the same capacity.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant at admission stage. From the material placed on record, it is evident that applicant

has also filed a representation dated 25.09.2009 (Annexure A/1) to the Chief Commission of Income Tax i.e. Respondent no. 2, which has not been decided so far.

3. In view of what has been stated above, I am of the view that this matter can be disposed of at this stage with the direction to Respondent no. 2 to decide the representation of the applicant dated 25.09.2009 (Annexure A/1) by passing a reasoned and speaking order. Accordingly, respondent no. 2 is directed to look into the grievance of the applicant, as ventilated by him in his representation dated 25.09.2009 (Annexure A/1), and ~~passed~~ <sup>pass</sup> a reasoned and speaking order within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Respondent no. 2 is also directed to specifically deal with the averments made by the applicant in his representation regarding engagement of fresh casual labour in his place by the Commissioner (Audit).

3. With these observations, the OA shall stand disposed of at admission stage with no order as to costs.



**(M.L. CHAUHAN)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

AHQ