

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA No.1258/2016

New Delhi, this the 07th day of April, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)**

Ku. Sushma Rani Rai
16, Circuit House, Civil Lines,
Meerut (U.P.)

.... Applicant.

(By Advocate : Shri Nagendra Singh)

Versus

1. Union of India
(through its Secretary)
Ministry of Defence,
South Block,
New Delhi.

2. Controller General of Defence Accounts,
Ullan Water Road, Palam,
Delhi Cantt.10.

3. The Controller General of Defence Accounts,
Pension Distribution,
Belvedere Complex, Meerut Cantt.,
U.P.

... Respondents.

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman :

This is the third round of litigation at the instance of the applicant.

2. Admittedly, the applicant was engaged as a Casual Labour in the year 1992 for a period of 89 days. Her services were dispensed with on 07.07.1994. After a lapse of almost three years, the applicant filed Writ Petition No.5196/1997 before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, which was dismissed vide order dated 08.04.2003. However, while dismissing the writ petition, it was observed that "when the petitioner applies to the respondents for being engaged as Casual Labour, the respondents shall consider her case sympathetically, subject of course to the availability of suitable work".

3. Not being satisfied, the applicant filed OA No.1078/2009 before this Tribunal, which also came to be disposed of vide order dated 23.04.2009 with direction to the respondents to treat the OA as supplementary representation of the applicant and consider her claim by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of the order. It seems that the applicant filed another representation which was disposed of vide impugned order dated 11.11.2014.

4. We have perused the impugned order. The claim of the applicant for engagement as full time Casual Labour has been declined. Admittedly, services of the applicant were dispensed with on 07.07.1994. It is more than 21 years now. Applicant has no right to be engaged on regular basis. We do not find any infirmity in the impugned order, nor there is any valid reason to issue any further direction. This Application is without any merit. Dismissed.

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

(Permod Kohli)
Chairman

/pj/