

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

O. A. No.063/00149/2015

Date of decision: 14.11.2017

...

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).
HON'BLE MRS. P. GOPINATH, MEMBER (A).**

...

Rimpu Kumar son of Shri Ram Sharan, Driver, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan, Himachal Pradesh Zone, Chander Building, Toto, Shimla (HP) and resident of Village Sarkari Sidhpur, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (Himachal Pradesh).

... APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India through its Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Shastri Bhawan, C-Wing, New Delhi.
2. Secretary, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension, Department of Personnel and Training, North Block, New Delhi.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure, North Block, New Delhi.
4. The Director General, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan, 2nd Floor, CORE-4, Scope Minar, Laxmi Nagar, Vikas Marg, Delhi-110092.
5. Zonal Director, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan, Himachal Pradesh Zone, Chander Building, Toto Shimla (HP).

... RESPONDENTS

PRESENT: Sh. Harinder Sharma, counsel for the applicant.
Sh. Ram Lal Gupta, counsel for the respondents.

ORDER (Oral)

...

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Present O.A. has been filed wherein applicant has impugned order dated 05.09.2014 (Annexure A-1), whereby respondents have rejected his claim for regularization.
2. On the commencement of hearing, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant very fairly submitted that similar issue came up

for consideration before the Principal Bench of the Tribunal in the case of **Gopal Singh & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors.** (O.A. No.1149/2013), which was dismissed on 14.09.2015 holding that services of the applicants therein cannot be regularized. He further submitted that the order became subject matter before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in judicial review in W.P.(C) No.9533/2015 (**Jitender Singh Rathore & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors.**) and W.P.(C) No.11022/2015 (**Mangulal Perteti & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors.**) which are pending and during the pendency, applicants therein were allowed to have minimum of the pay. He, therefore, made a statement at the Bar that since the similar matter is sub-judice before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, he may be given liberty to file a fresh O.A. after decision in the aforesaid cases on the same cause of action.

3. Learned counsel representing the respondents did not object to the prayer.

4. Ordered accordingly. No costs.

(P. GOPINATH)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Date: 14.11.2017.
Place: Chandigarh.

`KR'