

5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. No.119 OF 2004

IN

O.A. No.1907 OF 2003

New Delhi, this the 29th day of July, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI V.K. MAJOTRA, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)  
HON'BLE SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Charanjeet Singh S/o Shri Ajmer Singh  
R/o 41, Madhu Bhan,  
Delhi - 110092.

....Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri U. Srivastava)

Versus

1. Shri S.C. Kapil  
Commissioner Income Tax,  
Faridabad, Haryana.
2. Shri Umesh Chandra  
Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax,  
Range-II, Faridabad, Haryana.
3. Shri D.S. Kalyan,  
Joint Commissioner Income Tax,  
Faridabad, Haryana.

.....Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri V.P. Uppal)

ORDER (ORAL)

SHRI V.K. MAJOTRA, VICE CHAIRMAN (A):

Heard.

2. OA 1907/2004 was disposed of vide order dated 5.8.2003 (Annexure A/1) with the following directions to the respondents:-

"3. This OA is disposed of at this stage itself and without putting the respondents on notice, while rights of respondents shall not be prejudiced to consider the case of the applicant for re-engagement as daily wager vis-a-vis the claims of applicant's juniors and outsiders. Respondents to take this action within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. A copy of the OA may also be sent to the respondents."

16

3. Learned counsel of the applicant pointed out that against the directions of this Tribunal, outsiders S/Shri Sandeep Kumar and Deeraj Kumar have been engaged by the respondents.

4. Learned counsel of the respondents stated that such persons have been engaged by the respondents after 30.9.2003. They have also stated that the question of engaging the applicant <sup>to</sup> any further for computer work does not arise because his work and conduct were not found satisfactory and trustworthy.

5. Tribunal had directed that rights of the respondents shall not be prejudiced <sup>to</sup> while considering <sup>to</sup> the case of the applicant for re-engagement as daily wage vis-a-vis the applicant's juniors and outsiders. It is within the rights of the respondents to consider suitability of the applicant for engagement in view of his previous work and conduct.

6. In our view by denying engagement to the applicant the respondents have not committed any willful and contumacious contempt. In this behalf, it is clarified that we are treating respondents' reply dated 14.7.2004 to this petition as their orders of applicant's claim.

7. CP is dropped and notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

S. Raju  
(SHANKER RAJU)  
MEMBER (J)

V. K. Majotra  
29.7.04  
(V.K. MAJOTRA)  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

/ravi/