

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 10519/2017 & C.M. 43046/2017

RITU SOOD AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Praveen Kumar Singh,
Advocate

Versus

UOI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

%

21.12.2017

1. To seek counting of period of service from the date of initial joining in National Centre of Disaster Management (NCDM), petitioners had made Representation (*Annexure P-17 colly*) on 17th July, 2017.
2. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that instead of deciding petitioner's Representation (*Annexure P-17 colly*), second respondent had issued 'Notice of Offer' on the subject of absorption of employees in the establishment of National Centre of Disaster Management (*erstwhile known as 'NCDM'*) on 11th September, 2017, giving four days' time to exercise the option and in pursuance thereto, petitioners had exercised their option although they were regularized in service on the posts held by them for about two decades.
3. It is pointed out by petitioners' counsel that first petitioner had on 16th September, 2017 made a detailed Representation (*Annexure P-1*) to second respondent to count her period of service from the date of her joining NCDM and to extend benefit of old age pension scheme and other

retiral benefits but the said Representation (*Annexure P-1*) has not been responded to till date.

4. Despite service of advance notice, none has appeared on behalf of respondents.

5. In the facts and circumstances of this case, it is directed that in case petitioner's Representation of 16th September, 2017 (*Annexure- P-1*) is still pending, then respondent No.2 shall decide it by passing a speaking order within a period of six weeks and its fate be made known to petitioner No.1 within two weeks thereafter, so that first petitioner may avail of the remedies, as available in law, if need be.

6. So far as remaining petitioners are concerned, they are at liberty to make a fresh Representation to the second respondent within a week and if any such Representation is received, then second respondent shall decide it by passing a speaking order within the same time line and its fate be made known to petitioners within two weeks thereafter, so that petitioners may avail of the remedies, as available in law, if need be.

7. Needless to say that if petitioners' request is not acceded to, then reasons for not doing so, be spelt out by second respondent.

8. With aforesaid directions, this petition and application are disposed of.

9. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master to counsel for parties.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

DECEMBER 21, 2017

r