

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Tuesday 4th day of December Two Thousand And Eighteen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)

O.A. 310/439/2015

1. S. Krishnasamy, S/o. K. Seenuvasan;
2. N. Sundaralingam, S/o. Natarajan;
3. J. Srinivasan, S/o. C. Janakiraman;
4. S. Prabhakaran, S/o. N. Sevaraj;
5. R. Saravanan, S/o. Ramalingam;
6. B. Babou Saib, S/o. Bacha;
7. S. Arivazhagan, S/o. Selvaraj;
8. P. Narayanan, S/o. Poongavanam;
9. V. Sugumar, S/o. Vazhmuni;
10. K. Dhanaseelan, S/o. Cattavarayan;
11. A. Kannan, S/o. Arumugam;
12. M. Thirumeni Selvam, S/o. Muthukrishnan;
13. R. Ravi, S/o. V. Ranganathan.

....Applicants

(By Advocate: Mr. P. Rajendran)

Versus

1. The Chief Secretary to Government,
Government of Puducherry, Chief Secretariat,
Puducherry;
2. The Secretary to the Government,
Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms,
(Personnel Wing), Puducherry.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Syed Mustafa)

ORAL ORDER

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

Heard. This OA is filed by the applicant seeking the following relief:-

“ to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the second respondent in No. C. 18014/8/2014-DP & AR/GC/UII Puducherry dated 25.11.2014 and quash the same and direct the respondents to take appropriate action to bring the applicants into the regular establishment and grant them all consequential benefits.”

2. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are seeking temporary status for which they are entitled as full time casual labourers. He draws attention to para-6 of the reply filed by the respondents wherein it is stated that as per “The Puducherry Casual Labourers Engagement Regularization Scheme, 2009” a list of full time casual labourers had been notified and such full time casual labourers would be absorbed in regular posts as per their seniority as and when vacancies arose. Accordingly, one of the applicants, namely, Sri M. Thirumani Selvam was absorbed as Multi Tasking Staff (Security) in July, 2014. As regards other applicants, it is stated that they are also on the verge of regularization, as per their seniority. It is submitted that the OA could be disposed of in the light of these facts.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that the O.A. is wholly unwarranted as there is no allegation of any violation of the scheme of regularization followed by the respondents.

4. In view of the above, the matter does not appear to call for any interference by this Tribunal. O.A is dismissed. No costs.

(R. RAMANUJAM)
MEMBER (A)

04.12.2018

Asvs.