

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
(Circuit Bench: Jammu)**

...

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 061/1263/2017

Jammu, this the 29th day of March, 2019

...

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

...

1. Dr. Rubby Raina, aged 44 years, W/o Dr. Vipin Magotra, R/o 1/109, Indira Vihar, Old Janipur, Jammu.
2. Dr. Neeta Sawhney, aged 45 years, D/o Late Sh. Kuldeep Raj Sawhney, R/o H. o.43, Sector 1-A, Extension, Trikuta Nagar, Jammu.
3. Mr. Surender Kumar, aged 48 years, S/o Late Sh. Gian Chand, R/o Tapyal, PO & Tehsil Ghagwal, District Samba.
4. Ms. Kulvinder Kour, aged 51 years, W/o S. Charanjit Singh, R/o H.No.59 years, Sector 10, Nanak Nagar, Jammu.
5. Mr. Ganesh Dass, aged 51 years, S/o Late Sh. Jethu Ram, R/o 131, Pacci Dhakki, Jammu.
6. Mr. Bansi Lal, aged 52 years, S/o Late Sh. Tej Ram, R/o H.No.322, Sector 3, Gangyal, Jammu.

....APPLICANTS

(By Advocate: Shri Rahil Raja)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Secretary to Government, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, New Delhi.
3. Indian Council of Medical Research, through its Director General, Ansari Nagar, New Delhi.
4. The Director National Institute for Research in Reproductive Health, (NIRH), Jehangir, Merwanji Street, Parel, Mumbai.

5. Officer-in-Charge, Human Reproduction Research Centre (ICMR), Obstetrics & Gynecology Department, SMGS Hospital (Govt. Medical College), Jammu (J&K).

....RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: Shri Harshwardhan Gupta)

ORDER (oral)

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

With the consent of both the learned counsel for the parties, the main Original Application (O.A.) is taken up for final disposal.

2. In the present O.A. the applicants have challenged the impugned order dated 18.01.2017, whereby their claim for regularization of their service has been rejected.

3. The respondents have filed written statement wherein in para no. 7 it is submitted that they have already taken up the matter with the Govt. of India for regularization of services of 75 persons working under the HRRC project in various HRRC centers in the country, (including the applicants) but the decision in the matter has not been taken till date. Therefore, it is prayed by respondents that this O.A. may be disposed of at this stage, by giving liberty to the applicants to move application if need arises for revival of the O.A. after the decision is taken by the Govt. of India, in that relevant connection.

4. The learned counsel for the applicants has no objection to the indicated proposal, but he submitted that it be clarified that the impugned order will not come in the way of applicants, while taking a fresh decision in the matter.

5. Considering the fact that the matter is pending consideration with the Govt. of India for a decision, we dispose of this O.A. at this stage with liberty to the applicants to move an application for revival of this O.A., if the decision taken by the Govt. of India goes against their interest. It is also clarified that the rejection order, which the applicants have now impugned in this O.A., will not be a hindrance for consideration and taking a fresh decision for regularization of services of the applicants.

6. In the wake of above, the O.A. stands disposed of accordingly.

(P.GOPINATH)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Dated: 29.03.2019

‘SK’



