



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPSB No.538 of 2023 Kamla Devi Petitioner Vs. Union of India and others Respondents <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> <u>Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.</u> Mr. Shailabh Pandey, Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Rajesh Pandey, learned C.G.S.C. for the Union of India. 3. Petitioner filed an original application before C.A.T. claiming regularization on the post of Helper/Casual Worker in Defence Agricultural Research Laboratory, Pithoragarh, which was registered as O.A. No.794 of 2022. Petitioner stated that she is serving as Helper in the establishment of Defence Agricultural Research Laboratory, Pithoragarh since 1987. She relied upon a certificate which is alleged to have been issued by one Mr. T. Pant, Senior Scientist, Grade-C in support of said contention. 4. In the counter affidavit, respondents denied the statement made by the petitioner and stated that she never served in the capacity of Helper/Casual Worker or any other capacity in the said establishment. 5. The certificate relied by the petitioner, alleged to have been issued by Mr. T. Pant, Senior Scientist, Grade-C, was sent for examination to Forensic Science Laboratory by the employer on the direction of learned Tribunal. 6. Forensic Science Laboratory concerned in its report dated 04.02.2022 stated that it could not be ascertained that the document (certificate) submitted by petitioner is valid. 7. Since there was no other evidence available with the petitioner in support of her claim that she was employed with Defence Agricultural Research Laboratory, Pithoragarh and Mr. T. Pant, Senior Scientist, Grade-C reportedly stated that he never issued any certificate to the petitioner, therefore, learned Tribunal dismissed her original application vide judgment dated 23.06.2023.



		8. Petitioner has challenged the said judgment before us. 9. We are not inclined to interfere in the matter, as petitioner miserably failed to substantiate her claim that she was employed as Helper/Casual Worker with the Defence Agricultural Research Laboratory, Pithoragarh. 10. For claiming regularization, one has to prove that he/she served as a Daily Wager/Casual Worker in the establishment for sufficiently long period. Since petitioner failed to prove this basic fact, therefore Tribunal was justified in dismissing her application. 11. It is not the case of the petitioner that the impugned judgment is perverse or some relevant fact was overlooked. 12. Petitioner has challenged the judgment rendered by learned Tribunal only on the ground that the original application could not have been dismissed based only on the report of Forensic Science Laboratory as the flow of signature of Mr. T. Pant, Senior Scientist, Grade-C was bound to change, after 30 years. 13. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is not sufficient for setting aside the impugned judgment. Mr. T. Pant, Senior Scientist, Grade-C in his statement made before the Board of Officers reportedly stated that he never issued any certificate in favour of the petitioner. 14. Thus there is no scope of interference in the matter. 15. Accordingly writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed. (Pankaj Purohit, J.) 17.07.2026 SK (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 17.07.2026
--	--	--