

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

TUESDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/5TH KARTHIKA, 1937

OP (CAT).No. 38 of 2015 (Z)

AGAINST THE ORDER IN OA 1182/2012 of CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE
TRIBUNAL,ERNAKULAM BENCH DATED 22.11.2013

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS:

1. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
NEW DELHI 110 001.
2. PRASAR BHARATHI BROADCASTING CORPORATION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
NEWDELHI-110 001.
3. DIRECTOR GENERAL
ALL INDIA RADIO, AKASHVANI BHAVAN, PARLIAMENT STREET
NEW DELHI-110 001.

BY SRI.N.NAGARESH, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

RESPONDENTS :

1. PURUSHOTHAMAN.C., AGED 37 YEARS
S/O.P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR
RESIDING AT NADUKKANDY PARAMBIL HOUSE, KALLERIKKARA
MATTANUR P.O, KANNUR-670 702
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/COMPERE/ PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
2. SASEENDRAN, KARIMTHORAMNMAL, AGED 44 YEARS
S/O.ANDIKUTTY K., RESIDING AT EKAROO P.O
UNNIKULAM VIA, KOZHIKODE-673 574
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO KOZHIKODE-32.
3. KRISHNAKUMAR KANNOTH, AGED 43 YEARS
S/O.V.K.DAMODHARAN NAIR
RESIDING AT 'SAIKATHAM' KANHILERY P.O, MATTANNUR VIA
KANNUR-670 702
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.

4. SASIDHARAN C.M., AGED 44 YEARS
S/O.K.M.NARAYANAN NAMBIAR
RESIDING AT 'ADWAITHAM' KUTTICHIRA P.O, MULLAKKODI
MAYYIL VIA, KANNUR 670602
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
5. SHAJI YOHANNAN, AGED 42 YEARS
S/O.T.V.YOHANNAN
RESIDING AT THEKKANATH HOUSE NAYATHODE P.O
ANKAMALY VIA
ERNAKULAM-683 572 CASUAL ANNOUNCER/
COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOCHI-21.
6. SREEJA K.R., AGED 43 YEARS
W/O.HANEESHKUMAR P.
RESIDING AT THAYYIL HOUSE KOODALI P.O, KUMBHAM
KANNUR-670 592
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
7. SREEJA K.K., AGED 44 YEARS
W/O.SUDHEESH BABU M.C
RESIDING AT KANNIYATH HOUSE P.O.CHOVVA, KANNUR-6
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
8. RAJITHAKUMARI P., W/O.T.K.BINEESH, AGED 39 YEARS
CIVIL STATION P.O, KOZHIKODE-20
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.
9. RESHMA M.G., D/O.M.GOVINDAN, AGED 36 YEARS
RESIDING AT 'SANATHANAM', MEKKOTH
PUTHIYANIRATH P.O.ELATHUR, KOZHIKODE-673 303
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.
10. RAGHUNATHAN K.K., AGED 38 YEARS
S/O.K.K.VASUDEVAN NAMBOODIRI
RESIDING AT KOTTARATHIL HOUSE, KAVA-PERAVOOR P.O
MATTANUR KANNUR-670 702
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/ PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
11. RAJASREE C.K., AGED 41 YEARS
W/O.T.K.UNNIKRISHNAN, RESIDING AT 'VAMARAJE'
NEAR THRIKKANMADAM TEMPLE, NARATH P.O, KANNUR
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
12. RENJINI DEVI N.N., AGED 43 YEARS
W/O.SANTHOSH KUMAR A.S.
RESIDING AT NADUVILEDATH HOUSE, CHITTALI P.O
ALAKODE VIA
KANNUR-670 571 CASUAL ANNOUNCER/

COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.

13. KANCHANA M., W/O.JAYARAMAN T.P., AGED 44 YEARS
RESIDING AT MADATHIL HOUSE, VENGARI P.O
CALICUT-10 CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.
14. SATHYAN KALLURUTHY, AGED 44 YEARS
S/O.NARAYANAN NAIR
RESIDING AT KANNANCHERYPOYIL KALLURUTHY POST
OMASSERRY VIA, CALICUT
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, CALICUT-673 032.
15. ASHIK, S/O.BHASKARAN, AGED 48 YEARS
RESIDING AT 'AAYILYAM', ELAVANA HOUSE
P.O.GURU COLLEGE, KOZHIKODE- 673 014
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.
16. NISHA M.K., D/O.M.K.KARUNAKARAN, AGED 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT KARUNALAYAM, MOWANCHERRY P.O
KANNUR - 670613
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
17. NISHA K.V., W/O.K.T.UMESHAN, AGED 48 YEARS
RESIDING AT K.T.HOUSE, CHENGAL KOVVAPURAM
PAYANGADI KANNUR-670 303
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/ PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
18. RESHMA SHELLEY, AGED 39 YEARS
W/O.SHELLEY KAKKADAN
RESIDING AT "UPASANA" PANNENPARA POST CHALAD
KANNUR-670 014
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
19. NISHA P., W/O.JAYANANDAN, AGED 40 YEARS
RESIDING AT PAYYADI HOUSE, MARIKUNNU P.O
CALICUT-12 CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.
20. SITHARA M.G., W/O.SETHUMADHAVANA T., AGED 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT MANALERI HOUSE, CHEVAYOOR P.O, CALICUT- 17
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, CALICUT-7.
21. MALLIKA M. MADATHIL, AGED 42 YEARS
W/O.T.CHANDRASEKHARAN NAIR
RESIDING AT 'MANIDEEPAM' P.O.VENGARI, CALICUT-10
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOZHIKODE-32.

22. SIVAKUMARI U.K., AGED 43 YEARS
W/O.T.P.WILSON, RESIDING AT 'U.K. NIVAS'
C.K.PURAM CHALAD P.O, KANNUR-670 014
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
23. BALAMANI V.V., AGED 44 YEARS
D/O.LATE NARAYANAN V.V.
RESIDING AT VELLUVALAPPIL HOUSE, P.O.KANUL, KADAMBERI
KANNUR-670 564
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KANNUR-4.
24. N. AJITH, S/O.T.S.NARAYANAN NAIR, AGED 45 YEARS
RESIDING AT 15/48
THALIYIL NURSERY SCHOOL ROAD N.PARAVUR
ERNAKULAM-683 513
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOCHI-682 018.
25. N.K.USHADEVI, W/O.N.S.DHANANJAYAN, AGED 46 YEARS
RESIDING VAISHNAVI, PATTATH ROAD
CHALIKKAVATTOM VENNALA P.O, KOCHI, ERNAKULAM-682 028
CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOCHI-682 018.
26. THOMAS C.D., AGED 47 YEARS
S/O.C.T.DEVASSY, RESIDING AT CHIRAYIL HOUSE, 18/2408A
PALLICHAL ROAD, THOPPUMPADY
COCHIN-5 CASUAL ANNOUNCER/ COMPERE/PRODUCTION ASSISTANT
ALL INDIA RADIO, KOCHI-682 018.
- R1-25 BY ADV. SRI.C.S.GOPALAKRISHNAN NAIR
R BY ADV.MOHANA KANNAN

THIS OP (CAT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 27-10-2015, ALONG WITH
O.P.(CAT)NO.175/2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXT.P1 - TRUE COPY OF OA NO.1182/2012 DATED 18-12-2012 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

ANNEXURE A1 : COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION BEARING NO.CHN-9(1)95-P4 DATED 30.6.1995, ISSUED FROM THE ALL INDIA RADIO STATION AT KOCHI

ANNEXURE A2 : COPY OF THE ORDER BEARING NO.CHN-9(1)95-P4 DATED 20.09.1995, ISSUED FROM THE ALL INDIA RADIO STATION AT KOCHI

ANNEXURE A3 : COPY OF THE VANI CERTIFICATE DATED 03 JULY 2007, ISSUED AS REGARDS THE 2ND APPLICANT IN OA

ANNEXURE A4 : COPY OF THE INITIAL CONTRACT BEARING NO.CHN-15(5)95-P1 DATED 26.10.95 AS REGARDS THE 24TH APPLICANT.

ANNEXURE A5 : COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE ALL INDIA RADIO CASUAL ANNOUNCERS STATE TABLE DATED 29.12.2009

ANNEXURE A6 : COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 05.05.2008 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PROGRAMMES (POLICY) TOGETHER WITH REMINDERS DATED 21.05.2008 AND 06.06.2008.

ANNEXURE A7 : COPY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE DATED 18.02.2009

ANNEXURE A8 : COPY OF REPORT DATED 24.02.2009

ANNEXURE A9 : COPY OF COMMUNICATION DATED 09.06.2010 ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL ALL INDIA RADIO TO ALL STATIONS.

ANNEXURE A10 : COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 09.11.2010

ANNEXURE A11 : COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 18.11.2010, ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL TO ALL STATIONS OF ALL INDIA RADIO

ANNEXURE A12 : COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT PUBLISHED BY EXPRESS NEWS SERVICE DATED 02.04.2010

ANNEXURE A13 : COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 07.09.2005 IN OA NO.743/2000 RENDERED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT

ANNEXURE A14 : COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 05.08.2009 IN WP(C).NO.34948/2005 RENDERED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA

ANNEXURE A15 : COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 20.10.2011 SUBMITTED BY THE 1ST APPLICANT IN OA

ANNEXURE A16 : COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23. NOVEMBER 2011 IN OA NO.981/2011 RENDERED BY THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL

OP (CAT).No. 38 of 2015 (Z)

ANNEXURE A17 : COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 22.12.2012 SUBMITTED BY THE 24TH APPLICANT TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT IN OA

ANNEXURE A18 : COPY OF ORDER OF HON'BLE CAT, ERNAKULAM BENCH IN MA NO.492/2012 IN OA NO.981/2011 DATED 17.07.2012

ANNEXURE A19 : COPY OF THE LETTER BEARING F.NO.10/30/2012 SVI/729 DATED 03.10.2012, ISSUED FROM THE OFFICE OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT IN OA

ANNEXURE 20 : COPY OF THE ORDER BEAIRNG NO.32/10/2012-SVIII/682 DATED 15.10.2012 ISSUED ON BEHALF OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT

EXT.P2 - TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE PETITIONERS IN OA NO.1182/2012

EXT.P3 - TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN OA NO.1182/2012 DATED 22-11-2013 OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

EXT.P4- TRUE COPY OF ORDER IN R.A.NO.180/00023/2014 DATED 16-01-2015 OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS :

EXT.R1 : COPY OF THE SATELLITE MESSAGE DT.29.1.2009

EXT.R2 : COPY OF THE ORDER DT.7.9.2005 IN OA 743/2000 OF THE CAT ERNAKULAM

EXT.R3 : COPY OF THE SCHEME FOR REGULARIZATION, 1981

EXT.R4 : COPY OF THE ADVERTISEMENT ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION

/TRUE COPY/

P.A TO JUDGE

AV

**K. SURENDRA MOHAN
&
SHAJI P.CHALY, JJ.**

O.P.(CAT) Nos.38 & 175 of 2015

Dated this the 27th day of October, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

Surendra Mohan, J.

The respondents in O.A.No.1182 of 2012 and the review applicants in R.A.No.180/00023/2014 of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench have filed these original petitions aggrieved by the orders passed by the Tribunal in the said proceedings. The issue relates to regularisation of Casual Artists in the All India Radio. The respondents herein, who are such Casual Artists, had filed the Original Application before the Central Administrative Tribunal contending that, the failure on the part of the petitioners herein to finalise the scheme for regularisation of persons like them and to regularise them in service was arbitrary, discriminatory and unconstitutional. They also sought for the issue of a direction to finalise the scheme within a stipulated time. Ext.P1 is a copy of the O.A filed by the respondents. Along with the O.A, the respondents had produced copy of an order dated 15.10.2012 of the Deputy Director of Administration acting on behalf of the Director General wherein, while disposing of a

representation submitted by the respondents, it was stated that there was a scheme for regularisation of such casual employees. In the reply statement filed on behalf of the petitioners also, the above stand was reiterated. In view of the above, the Tribunal by Ext.P3 order, disposed of the O.A directing the petitioners herein to finalise the scheme within a time limit of six months.

2. Despite the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, since no scheme was finalised within the time limit stipulated, the respondents initiated action against the petitioners for contempt. Thereupon, the petitioners preferred an application for review of the order Ext.P3. The review application was dismissed by Ext.P4 order, holding that, actually no grounds were available for review of Ext.P3 order. The petitioners are before us challenging the said orders Exts.P3 and P4.

3. According to the learned Assistant Solicitor General of India Sri.N.Nagaresh, though it is true that a statement has been made in the order dated 15.10.2012 that a scheme for regularisation was on the anvil, the said statement was not correct. The same was made on the basis of a mistake. At that

time, the only scheme that was being considered was one to regularise the casual employees of the Doordarshan. It is contended by the learned ASGI that, the said scheme has also been subsequently dropped. It is the said mistake that has been repeated in the reply statement also. According to the learned ASGI, the respondents should not be permitted to capitalise on a genuine mistake committed by the officers. It is further submitted that, casual employees like the respondents number as many as 4000 in the All India Radio and therefore, implementation of a scheme for regularisation of all its employees would result in considerable financial burden to the exchequer. Therefore, according to the learned ASGI, this is a fit case in which Exts.P3 and P4 orders require interference in exercise of our power under Article 227 of the Constitution.

4. According to Adv.Sri.C.S.Gopalakrishnan Nair, Counsel for the respondents, the respondents are persons who have been working as casual employees for the past more than two decades. They are persons who have completed the age of 40 or 45 years, with no hope of any alternative prospects of employment. Having toiled for the petitioners herein for the best part of their life, there is absolutely no justification for not

regularising them. It is also the contention of the learned counsel that, the order dated 15.10.2012 has been issued on behalf of the Director General of All India Radio. The same was issued with the concurrence of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The same stand has been reiterated without any ambiguity in the reply statement filed before the Central Administrative Tribunal also. A categorical statement made therein cannot be characterised as the result of a mistake. The present stand adopted by the petitioners is the result of an afterthought, in the context of the contempt proceedings that were initiated against the petitioners for non-implementation of the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal. The submissions made, being bereft of *bonafides* are only to be rejected, according to the learned counsel. The learned counsel also places reliance on the report of the Standing Committee of Labour (2014-15) of the Lok Sabha wherein, the issue has been considered and regularisation of all employees like the respondents recommended. Therefore according to the learned counsel, a scheme for regularisation was in existence and was being considered, at all times. On the above grounds, the learned counsel seeks dismissal of the original

petition.

5. O.P(CAT).No.175 of 2015 also concerns similar casual employees as in this case. Identical contentions have been advanced in the above case also. Adv.Sri.T.C.Govindaswamy appears for the respondents. In the above referred case, the only difference is that, a review application was not filed.

6. We have heard the respective counsel at length. We have also considered the contentions advanced before us, anxiously. A perusal of the order dated 15.10.2012 issued on behalf of the Director General of Prasar Bharati, a copy of which is produced as Annexure A-20 forming part of Ext.P1, shows that there is a statement regarding formulation of a scheme for regularisation of casual employees. The relevant portion of the said order in O.P.(CAT)No.38 of 2015 reads as under :

"Whereas regarding Annexure A-14 representation dated 20.10.2011 produced in the O.A. and reminder representation dated 22.12.2011 it is stated that Prasar Bharati is in process of formulation of a Scheme for regularisation of Casuals. As such the regularisation of Casuals shall be taken up in terms of said Scheme immediately after the said scheme is finalized.

2. Annexure A-14 representation dated 20.10.2011 of the O.A.No.981/2011 and reminder representation

dated 22.12.2011 of the applicants are disposed of accordingly.

This issues with the approval of the competent authority.”

The reply statement filed by the petitioners in O.A.No.1182 of 2012 also reiterates the above stand. The relevant portion of the reply statement which is produced as Ext.P2 in these proceedings is extracted hereunder for convenience of reference :

“On the basis of Honorable Tribunal order dated 17.07.2012 the 3rd Respondent has issued an order stating that Prasar Bharati is in process of formulation of a Scheme for regularization of Casuals. As such the regularization of Casuals shall be taken up in terms of said Scheme immediately after the said scheme is finalized. It may also please be appreciated that even if a scheme is to be formed the same also is a time consuming matter as the 3rd respondent has to verify/scrutinize its various aspects before preparing the terms and conditions of regularization, if it is necessary to be framed. Thereafter the same is to be submitted to the higher authorities viz. Office of Chief Executive Officer, Prasar Bharati; Secretary Ministry of Information and Broadcasting; Secretary, Ministry of Legal Affairs; and also the authorities viz. UPSC; DoP&T etc.”

7. In view of the above stand taken by the petitioners, the

Central Administrative Tribunal disposed of O.A.No.1182 of 2012 directing the petitioners herein to finalise the scheme within an outer limit of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. The said order was passed on 22.11.2013. It was the said order that was sought to be reviewed in the year 2014 by the petitioners contending that, the statements made in Annexure A-20 order as well as the reply statement were the result of a mistake. By Ext.P4 order, the Central Administrative Tribunal has dismissed the review application finding that there were no error apparent on the face of the record warranting a review of the order, as sought for. According to the learned ASGI, the orders Exts.P3 and P4 require to be interfered with and set aside for the reason that, they were passed on the basis of erroneous assumptions.

8. Though it is contended by the learned ASGI that the statements made in Annexure A-20 order as well as reply statement filed before the Central Administrative Tribunal were the result of a mistake, it is difficult to accept the said statement. The fact remains that, the order Annexure A-20 was passed by a responsible and high official of the Prasar Bharati. While disposing of the representation submitted by

the respondents, he was exercising a quasi judicial function. It cannot be believed that, such a responsible and high official would have issued the order, without properly ascertaining and taking note of the facts. Thereafter, when the O.A. was filed before the Central Administrative Tribunal, a reply statement has been filed, reiterating the very same stand. The stand of the petitioners is worded in very categorical terms that there was a scheme for regularisation of the Casual employees that was under consideration. Even before us, it is not disputed by the learned ASGI that there was a scheme for regularisation of Casual employees, insofar as the Doordarshan was concerned. However, according to him, the scheme was subsequently dropped. It is contended that, it was under the mistaken impression that the said scheme would apply to Prasar Bharati as a whole, that the statement in Annexure A-20 order as well as the reply statement were made. However, apart from the mere statement to the said effect made before us now as well as before the Central Administrative Tribunal in the review application, there is absolutely no material to support the said submission. In all likelihood, the attempt of the petitioners is to put on record, a change in the stand that was adopted by them

later. Having made the statements as borne out by Annexure A-20 order and having reiterated the same in the reply statement filed in the O.A. before the Central Administrative Tribunal, we are not prepared to accept that, they were the result of a simple mistake.

8. A perusal of the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal shows that, what has been directed is only to finalise the scheme that was stated to be in existence, within an outer limit of six months. The Central Administrative Tribunal has not issued any directions regarding the content of the scheme or the manner in which the scheme has to be formulated. Therefore, we are not satisfied that any prejudice has been caused to the petitioners by the issue of the said direction. It is for the petitioners to formulate a scheme, in accordance with the assurance given to the Central Administrative Tribunal, without further delay. We are not satisfied that, Exts.P3 and P4 orders suffer from any errors justifying an interference therewith under Article 227 of the Constitution. For the above reasons, we decline interference with the order Ext.P2 in O.A.No.475 of 2013 that is under challenge in O.P.(CAT).No.175 of 2015 also.

9. Since contempt proceedings are pending against the petitioners for not having complied with the directions of the Central Administrative Tribunal, we are inclined to accept the request of the learned ASGI for granting further time to comply with the orders of the Central Administrative Tribunal in O.A.No.1182 of 2012 and O.A.No.475 of 2013. Accordingly, the time limit stipulated for complying with the directions in the orders of the Central Administrative Tribunal referred to above are extended by a period of six months from today.

Sd/-
K. SURENDRA MOHAN, JUDGE

Sd/-
SHAJI P.CHALY, JUDGE

AV