

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**O.A No. 1574/2018**

New Delhi, this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018

**Hon'ble Mrs. Jasmine Ahmed, Member (J)**

**Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)**

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

....Applicant

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

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

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Mrs. Jasmine Ahmed, Member (J)**

Learned counsel for applicant states that the applicant is on deputation since 05.04.2013 which was initially for a period of three years and an extension of two more years was granted to him. So he has completed five years of deputation period. Now, counsel for applicant states that he is scheduled

to retire in December, 2019 and prays that he may be allowed to continue with the deputation and in this regard he has preferred a representation dated 27.03.2018. He states that, at this stage he will be happy and satisfied if a direction is given by this Tribunal to respondents to take a decision on his representation dated 27.03.2018 within a stipulated time frame.

2. Accordingly, taking into consideration the statement given by the counsel at the Bar, we feel it unnecessary to keep the O.A pending. Hence, the respondents are directed to take a decision on his representation dated 27.03.2018 within one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for applicant also states that though the applicant has completed five year's deputation period on 05.04.2018, no order has been passed by the respondents in regard to the repatriation of the applicant. Hence, if any decision is not being taken by the respondents, he may be allowed to continue with the deputation post.

4. Accordingly, respondents are directed not to repatriate the applicant till any decision is taken on his representation.

5. The O.A is disposed of with the above direction. It is made clear that we have not commented anything on the merit of the case.

(Uday Kumar Varma)  
Member (A)

(Jasmine Ahmed)  
Member (J)

/Mbt/