

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA/310/00982/2019

Dated 31st day of July Two Thousand Nineteen

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, Member (J)
HON'BLE MR. T. JACOB, Member (A)**

G.Nagarajan,
Pudhu Kudiyiruppu,
Pudhu Colony,
36, Eraiyyur, Veppanthattai Taluk,
Perambalur District 621133.Applicant

By Advocate M/s. M. Ramdass

Vs

1. Union of India,
rep by Secretary to Govt. of India,
Ministry of Railways,
Raj Bhavan, New Delhi 110001.
2. The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Chennai 600003.
3. The Principal Cum Personnel Officer,
Head Quarters Office,
Personnel Branch,
Southern Railway,
Chennai 600003.
4. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
DPO & PIO/TPJ,
Divisional Office,
Personnel Branch,
Southern Railway, Tiruchirapalli.
5. The Inspector (Administration),
PWI/A/VRI,
Southern Railway,
Viruthachalam Junction, Viruthachalam.

....Respondents

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Member(J))

This is an OA filed seeking the following reliefs :

"I. To call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 4th respondent by the proceedings No. PB/CS/30/Misc/TPJ/2017 dated 19.04.2018 and set aside the same consequently order passed by the 4th respondent.

ii. Consequent direction the respondent to pay all terminal benefits and pension in lieu of reinstatement.

iii. And pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice."

2. According to the applicant, he was employed as a casual labour from 01.08.1972 in Virudhachalam Railway Junction and he was issued with a Casual labour service card & he was being paid Rs. 80/- per month. The respondents orally terminated his employment on 31.08.1992 without giving an opportunity to defend his case. According to him, he was terminated in violation of principles of natural justice & failed to consider his casual labour service. The respondents had denied pension also.

3. Heard. We had perused the pleadings. The alleged termination had taken place in 1992 and there are no records available to show how many days he had worked & what was the reason for termination. The respondents had rejected the representation stating that there are no records available for showing his employment. The applicant has failed to make out a case before the Tribunal. Hence, the OA is dismissed at the threshold itself.

**(T.Jacob)
Member(A)**

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

31.07.2019

SKSI