

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA 1986/2014

New Delhi this the 19th day of October, 2016.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.SULLAR, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE DR.BIRENDRA KUMAR SINHA, MEMBER (A)

Subhash Chand, aged 43 years,
S/o Shri Rattan Singh,
Disengaged contract Driver from
Delhi Jal Board, New Delhi
r/o Vill. & PO Khera Kala, Delhi-82 ... Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Yogesh Sharma)

VERSUS

1. Delhi Jal Board,
Through the Commissioner,
Delhi Jal Board, Varunalaya Phase-II,
Karol Bagh, New Delhi.
2. The Assistant Commissioner (G)-1,
Delhi Jal Board, Varunalaya Phase-II,
Karol Bagh, New Delhi. ... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri P.K.Singh for Shri Rajeev Kumar)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice M.S. Sullar, Member (J)

1. The crux of the facts and material, which needs a necessary mention for the limited purpose of deciding the instant Original Application (OA), and emanating from the record, is that, applicant Subhash Chand S/o Rattan Singh (Ex-Servicemen), was offered the post of Vehicle driver on contract basis for a period of six months only at a consolidated remuneration of Rs.3500/- per month, vide letter dated 5.06.1998 (Annexure A-4). He was stated to have caused a motor vehicle accident.

2. Subsequently, he was removed and his services were discontinued w.e.f. 27.04.1999, i.e. from the date of road accident in front of G-52, Raja Park, Delhi, vide impugned order dated

25.06.1999 (Annexure A-3) by the competent authority. According to the applicant, since he has been acquitted by the criminal Court so he is entitled for reengagement and regularization of his services. Thus, he has preferred the instant OA claiming his reengagement and regularization in service, invoking the provisions of Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

3. The respondents have refuted the claim of the applicant and filed their reply, wherein they have stoutly denied all the allegations and grounds contained in the OA and prayed for its dismissal.

4. During the course of arguments, the main grievance of learned counsel at this stage is that, although the applicant had already filed representations dated 9.9.2011 (Annexure A-2) and 29.01.2013 (Annexure A-1) for redressal of his grievances, but the same have not yet been decided by the competent authority. The learned counsel for the respondents has acknowledged the factual matrix.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, having gone through the record with their valuable assistance, the main OA is disposed of with the direction to Director, Delhi Jal Board (respondent) to consider and decide the representations dated 29.01.2013 (Annexure A-1) and dated 09.09.2011 (Annexure A-2) by passing a speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and in accordance with law. However, the parties are left to bear their own costs.

(Dr. BIRENDRA KUMAR SINHA)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE M.S.SULLAR)
MEMBER (J)

`sk'