

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**CP No. 585/2016
OA No. 2006/2013**

New Delhi this the 28th day of November, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)
Hon'ble Dr. B.K. Sinha, Member (A)**

Shri Anand Prakash Dube,
S/o Shri Raj Mani Dube,
Aged 55 years,
Working as Offset Machine Man,
R/o E-5, Jawahar Park,
Laxmi Nagar,
Delhi-110 092

- Petitioner/Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Manjeet Singh Reen)

VERSUS

Union of India & Others: through

1. Shri Arun Kumar Bansal,
Director,
Directorate of Printing,
Govt. of India Press,
B-Wing, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi
2. Shri Bhagwan Sahoo,
General Manager,
Govt. of India Press,
Minto Road, New Delhi
3. Shri Rajiv Gauba,
Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development,
Govt. of India Press,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi

- Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J):

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. This Tribunal disposed of the OA No. 2006/2013 on 08.10.2015 filed by the applicant as under:-

“10. The Original Application is disposed of with direction to the respondents to re-deploy the applicant as Offset Machine Man or DTP Operator in any of the Presses of Government of India where the vacancy in such grade is available and if the vacancy is not available then against next available vacancy as and when it arise. No costs.”

3. In compliance of the aforesaid order, the respondents passed the order, re-deploying the applicant in the post of Offset Machine Man with immediate effect vide order dated 22.09.2016.

4. The petitioner, who was the applicant in the OA, filed the present CP, alleging that certain others, who are junior to him, were promoted to the post of Offset Machine Man vide order dated 04.01.2016 and in fact, as per the directions of this Tribunal in OA No. 2006/2013, once a vacancy in the category of the Offset Machine Man is available, the respondents ought to have re-deployed the applicant, before considering any other cases.

5. It is seen that in OA No. 2006/2013, this Tribunal had not given any direction to the respondents with

regard to the seniority or otherwise of the applicant vis-à-vis any other employee. It is also not the case of the petitioner that any of his alleged juniors were parties to the O.A.

6. In the circumstances, we do not find any merit in the CP and accordingly, the same is dismissed. However, this order shall not preclude the petitioner from agitating his grievances, if any, in accordance with law.

(Dr. B.K. Sinha)
Member (A)

(V. Ajay Kumar)
Member (J)

/lg/