

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**O.A.s No. 591/2019 to 593/2019**

**Dated Monday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019**

**PRESENT**

**Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Administrative Member  
&**

**Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Judicial Member**

J. Balasubramanian  
2/503, Road Street  
Ko Mavidanthal  
Karkudal P.O.

Virudhachalam Taluk 606 003.

...Applicant in OA 591/2019

A. Govindasamy  
No. 115, Meenambgai Nagar  
9<sup>th</sup> Street, Jeeva Nagar  
Jai Hindpuram  
Madurai – 625 011.

... Applicant in OA 592/2019

D. Ramesh  
9/34-E, Muthukumarasamy Nagar  
Bhudhamur  
Virudhachalam Tk – 606 001.

... Applicant in OA 593/2019

By Advocate M/s G. Eathirajulu

1. The Director General  
Indian Council of Medical Research  
V. Ramalingaswamy Bhavan  
Post Box No. 4911  
Ansari Nagar, New Delhi – 110 029.
2. The Secretary  
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare  
Nirman Bhavan, Ansari Nagar  
New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Director  
ICMR Vector Control Research Centre  
Gorimedu, Indira Nagar  
Puducherry.

4. Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)  
Centre for Research Medical Entomology  
Rep. By its Director  
No. 4, Sarojini Street  
Chinna Chokkikulam, Madurai – 625 002. ... Respondents in all OAs

By Advocate Ms Sunitha Kumari

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

As it is submitted that the grievance of the applicants and the relief sought in the three OAs were one and the same, they are taken up together and disposed of by this common order.

2. The relief sought by the applicant in OA 591/2019 is as under:

“To call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent in his office proceedings No. ICMR/VCRC/Estt/Misc/208-19/1482 dated 25.02.2019 and quash the same and consequently regularise the service of the applicant with all attendant benefits and pass such further or other order”

3. The applicants had been engaged on projects for a long time and they are seeking regularisation of their services in the respondent institution. Although a detailed representation was made by them dated 02.01.2019, the respondents passed the impugned order dated 25.02.2019 which is cryptic and says nothing beyond the alleged ineligibility of the applicant for regularisation as there is no provision for regularisation of project services in the ICMR Recruitment Rules.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the applicants had referred to precedent cases where persons appointed in the projects had also been granted the benefit of regularisation in ICMR notwithstanding the alleged absence of any provision therefor.

Accordingly the applicants would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to consider their representation and pass a detailed reasoned and speaking order.

5. Ms. Sunitha Kumari takes notice for the respondents.

6. Keeping in view the limited relief urged and without going into the substantive merits of the case, since it is alleged that there is discrimination between the applicants and similarly placed persons in the matter of regularisation of their services and specific names have been mentioned in the representation of the persons alleged to have been regularised, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondents to review their impugned communication dated 25.02.2019 and pass a fresh reasoned and speaking order duly dealing with the allegation that similarly placed persons had been regularised within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

6. OA are disposed of accordingly.

**(P. MADHAVAN)**  
**Member (J)**  
AS

**29.04.2019**

**(R.RAMANUJAM)**  
**Member (A)**