

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**MA/310/00045/2019 in OA/310/01222/2016**

**Dated Monday the 4<sup>th</sup> day of February Two Thousand Nineteen**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)  
HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, Member (J)**

1.K.Arikrishnan,  
2.S.Sivanesan,  
3.V.Baskaran,  
4.G.Annadurai. ....Applicants/Applicants

By Advocate M/s. V. Vijay Shankar

Vs

1.The Union of India,  
rep by its Special Director General,  
Southern Region,  
CPWD, Rajaji Bhavan,  
Chennai 90.

2.The Chief Engineer,  
Besant Nagar, Chennai 90.

3.The Superintending Engineer,  
PCD/CPWD, Pondicherry 6. ....Respondents/Respondents

By Advocate Mr. K. Rajendran

**ORAL ORDER****(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member(A))**

When the matter is called, one Mr. Goutam claims to represent the Counsel for the applicant and seeks adjournment.

2. On perusal, it is seen that the OA was dismissed by an order of this Tribunal dt. 27.11.2018 wherein it was noted that on 15.11.2018 when the matter came up for hearing, counsel for the applicant was represented by his junior. Counsel for the respondents had submitted that the applicants were already disengaged and the OA had become infructuous. Accordingly, the matter was directed to be listed under the caption "For Dismissal" on 27.11.2018. As the arguing counsel was not present on that date also, the matter was dismissed for default.

3. On further perusal, it is also seen that when the matter was called on 02.08.2018, it was submitted that the applicant had no *locus standi* to file this OA as he was never a Government employee. He was engaged by a contractor to whom the same work was outsourced by the department and, therefore, the applicant could not agitate his grievance before this Tribunal.

4. In the above background of this case, we are of the view that no justification has been made out for restoration of the OA. MA for restoration is dismissed.

**(P. Madhavan)  
Member(J)**

**(R. Ramanujam)  
Member(A)**

**04.02.2019**

SKSI