

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00271/2019

Chandigarh, this the 18th day of March, 2019

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

...

1. Harmesh Singh son of Ram Asra, Mason (Daily Wager) Group C, aged 53 years, Office of SDE C-12, Sector 17, Chandigarh – 160017.
2. Gurnam Singh son of Gurbax Singh, Mason (Daily Wager) Group C, aged 48 years, Office of SDE Road, Sub Division No. 1, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.

....Applicants

(Present: Mr. Inderjit Kaushal, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration through its Secretary, Department of Engineering, U.T. Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
2. The Chief Engineer, Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration, CP Division No. 1, U.T. Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.

.....

Respondents

(Present: Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate)

ORDER (Oral)

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. Heard.
2. MA No. 060/00514/2019 is allowed and the applicants are allowed to join together to file this single O.A.
3. By means of the present O.A., the applicants are before this Court seeking issuance of a direction to the respondents to regularize their services as they are serving the department for last more than 29 years.
4. At the very outset, learned counsel submitted that the applicants, before approaching this Court, moved a legal notice

dated 20.02.2019 (Annexure A-8) to the respondents, based on a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case **of U.T. Chandigarh and Others Vs. Sampat Singh & Others**, followed in order dated 14.09.2015 rendered by this Court in the case of **Mohinder Singh & Others Vs. U.T. Chandigarh & Others** (O.A. NO. 060/00723/2014), which has not been decided till date. He suffered a statement that the applicants would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to take a call on their legal notice.

5. Issue notice to the respondents.

6. At this stage, Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate, appears and accepts notice. He does not object to the disposal of the O.A., in the above terms. He, however, prays for grant of reasonable time to do the needful.

7. In the wake of above, the O.A. is disposed of, in limine, with a direction to the Competent Authority amongst the respondents to consider the indicated legal notice (Annexure A-8) in light of relied upon judgment including decision in the case of Mohinder Singh (supra), by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the O.A. shall not be construed an expression of any opinion on the merit of the case. No costs.

(P. GOPINATH)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)
Dated: 18.03.2019

'mw'