

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00614/2019
Chandigarh, this the 30th day of September, 2019

...
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MS. ARCHANA NIGAM, MEMBER (A)

...

Karam Chand s/o Late Sh. Dhuni Chand, aged 64 years, R/o House No. 1768, Sector 45-B, Burail, Chandigarh – 160047. Group C

....Applicant

(Present: Mr. Sunil K. Chaudhary, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union of India through its Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi – 110001.
2. Chandigarh Administration through its Secretary, Homes, Civil Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
3. The Director General of Police, Union Territory, Addl. Deluxe Building, Sector 9, Chandigarh.

.....

Respondents

ORDER (Oral)

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. Applicant, in the present O.A. has impugned the order dated 23.04.2019 (Annexure A-3) whereby his services have been terminated, on attaining the age of 62 years.
2. Heard.
3. Learned counsel argued that the impugned order has been passed without putting the applicant on notice and it is non-speaking one as it does not spell out any reason for terminating his services, therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed and set aside.
4. We have gone through the pleadings on record. In earlier O.A. (No.675/CH/2002) filed by the applicant, vide decision dated

10.03.2003, this Court allowed the O.A. to the extent that his services were to be restored on the same terms and conditions as were prior to termination order dated 20.06.2002. The respondents, in compliance with those directions, allowed the applicant to continue on daily wages basis till the age of superannuation i.e. 62 years. The prayer of the applicant for grant of pensionary benefits does not have any substance as his services were only on daily wages basis, and no pensionary benefits are admissible to such employees, more so when claim for regularization was not even pressed in the indicated O.A. as applicant was over-age at the time of initial engagement.

5. In view of the above noted facts, we are of the opinion that there is no illegality in the impugned order. The O.A. stands dismissed accordingly, in limine.

(ARCHANA NIGAM)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)
Dated: 30.09.2019

'mw'