

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No. 2267/2018  
MA No. 4197/2018**

**New Delhi, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2018**

**Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Shrivastava, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)**

Om Prakash Verma SSF Ct. No. 1432  
Aged 59 years, S/o late Shri K.L. Verma  
Now working as JRO, SSO, MHA, Group 'C'  
Resident of 83-B, Pitampura, Delhi – 88.

....Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mr. H.P. Chakraborty)

**Versus**

1. Union of India Through  
The Secretary  
Ministry of Home Affairs  
Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Security Officer  
Secretariat Security Force  
Ministry of Home Affairs  
Government of India, New Delhi.
3. The Chief Supervisor  
Reception Organisation  
Secretariat Security Force  
Ministry of Home Affairs  
Government of India, New Delhi.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. Gyanendra Singh)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Mr. K.N. Shrivastava:**

The applicant was appointed as Sepoy on 14.05.1984 in the Secretariat Security Force (SSF), which comes under the administrative control of Ministry of Home Affairs(MHA).

2. Apparently, some Sepoy from SSF were deployed to work as Junior Reception Officer (JRO) in the year 2013, applicant was one of them. Vide Annexure A-4 order dated 04.04.2016, the deployment of some Sepoy as JRO was extended but the applicant was left out. He, accordingly, has approached the Tribunal in the instant OA seeking a direction to the respondents to allow him to continue as JRO.

3. During the course of the hearing today, Sh. H.P. Chakraborty, learned counsel for applicant submitted that the applicant has already re-joined SSO, i.e., his parent organisation on completion of his deputation period as JRO. He, however, submitted that the respondents may be directed to extend deployment/deputation of the applicant as JRO for one more year.

4. Considering the nature of relief claimed, we proceed ahead to adjudicate the controversy involved without insisting on written reply from the respondents. As noticed hereinabove, the applicant was allowed to complete his deployment/deputation as JRO for the period initially stipulated. The respondents, for their internal reasons, have decided not to extend his continuation as JRO any further. The applicant has already re-joined his parent organisation. Sh. H.P. Chakraborty, learned counsel for applicant submitted that the liberty may be given to the applicant to represent his case for reconsideration to the respondents in accordance with Annexure A-7 OM dated 17.07.2016 of DoP&T.

5. Apparently, the applicant had approached the Tribunal earlier in OA No. 1574/2018 which was disposed of vide order dated 24.04.2018 directing the respondents to dispose of the pending representation of the applicant. Accordingly, the respondents have passed the Annexure A-2 order.

6. The contention of Sh. Chakraborty is that while passing Annexure A-2, order respondents have not taken into consideration the DoP&T Annexure A-7 order dated 17.07.2016.

7. In view of the above, we dispose of this OA in the following directions :

- a. The applicant shall submit a fresh representation to the respondents seeking his deployment/deputation as JRO within two weeks from the date of this order.*
- b. The respondents shall dispose of such representation within a period of eight weeks from the date of its receipt by passing a reasoned and speaking order. While doing so, the respondents shall keep in view the Annexure A-7 DoP&T OM dated 17.07.2016.*

**(S.N. Terdal)**  
**Member (J)**

**(K.N. Shrivastava)**  
**Member (A)**

/anjali/