



WEB COPY



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.06.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16360 of 2024

Prem Chandra : Petitioner in
WP No.16355 of 2024

Padmaraja K : Petitioner in
WP No.16358 of 2024

Dinesh Kumar : Petitioner in
WP No.16360 of 2024

versus

1.Union of India,
Represented by the Chief Administrative Officer (P),
Personnel Division,
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre,
Central Complex,
Trombay,
Mumbai-400 085.



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

2.Chief Administrative Officer,
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre Facilities,
Nuclear Recycle Board,
Kalpakkam-603 102.

3.The Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench,
Represented by its Registrar,
Chennai-600 104.

: Respondents in
all writ petitions

PRAYER in WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16360 of 2024: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for the issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records pertaining to the common order of 3rd respondent Tribunal made in OA.Nos. 196, 200 and 201 of 2022 respectively dated 10.01.2024 and quash the same, insofar as the petitioners are concerned, consequently direct the respondents 1 and 2 to restore the petitioners' initial appointment in the grade of Tradesman-D with all consequential.

For the Petitioners : Mr.R.Makaichamy
in all WPs

For the Respondents : Mr.S.Janarthanam
in all WPs Senior Panel Counsel
for respondents 1 and 2
third respondent-Tribunal



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

(Order of the Court was made by *D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.*)

These writ petitions are filed challenging the common order in OA.Nos. 196, 200 and 201 of 2022, dated 10.01.2024, passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal and consequently, direct the respondents 1 and 2 to restore the petitioners' initial appointment in the grade of Tradesman-D with all consequential benefits.

Brief facts of the case:

2.1. The petitioners were appointed on 19.02.1998 as Tradesman 'D', in the pay scale of Rs.4500-7000. On completion of probation period, the respondents arbitrarily re-designated the petitioners as Tradesman 'C' carrying lower pay scale of Rs.4000-6000. Similarly re-designated Tradesmen at BARC, Mumbai, challenged the arbitrary impugned order of the respondents before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai Bench in O.A.No.736 of 2000. The Central Administrative Tribunal, by order dated 18.02.2002, allowed the said OA in favour of those persons.



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

Thereafter, the respondents herein filed appeal before the High Court of Bombay in WP No.2356 of 2002. The said writ petition came to be dismissed by the High Court of Bombay on 05.07.2018. The order of the Tribunal, Mumbai Bench, was implemented vide order dated 11.01.2019.

2.2. After the order passed in OA No.736 of 200 has been given effect to, the petitioners herein had made representations to the respondents claiming the same benefit. The second respondent, rejected the said representations, on the ground that the petitioners were not party in the aforesaid OA No. 736 of 2000.

2.3. Aggrieved by the said rejection order, the petitioners filed original applications in OA.Nos. 196, 200 and 201 of 2022 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chennai Bench. The Tribunal, by a common order dated 10.01.2024 dismissed the said original applications on the ground of delay and laches and further held that the petitioners have not challenged the policy decision as well as their absorption order. Hence, the petitioners have filed the present writ petitions.



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the order passed in WP No.2356 of 2002 is applicable to the facts of the present case. He further submitted that since it was a policy decision taken by the department, the law of delay and laches would not apply for challenging the aforesaid proceedings of the respondent Department. Hence, he seeks for setting aside the common order passed by the Tribunal and allowing the writ petitions.

4. Learned Senior Panel Counsel appearing for the respondent Department reiterated the submissions made before the Tribunal.

5. Heard the parties and perused the materials available on record.

6. We have gone through the order passed by the Tribunal. The contention of the petitioners has been discussed and well considered by the Tribunal. With regard to implementation of policy decision, the Tribunal has stated that before implementing the said policy decision taken by the Department, the Department has given wide publicity. Further, the



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

petitioners have accepted the said policy decision of the Department and subsequent promotion, and did not have any grievance for the aforesaid decision taken by the Department.

7. It is seen that similarly placed persons have filed original application before the Tribunal, Bombay Bench and succeeded in the aforesaid original application. Challenging the said order, the respondents herein filed writ petition and the same came to be dismissed by the High Court of Bombay. Thereafter, these petitioners suddenly woke up and made representations to the respondent herein, after a lapse of 20-22 years seeking similar relief as granted to similarly placed persons in OA No.736 of 2000. When the representations were rejected on the ground that they were not party in OA No.736 of 2000, the petitioners herein had approached the Tribunal and the same was dismissed on the ground that the Central Administrative Tribunal Act has clearly prescribed the limitation period for challenging the order passed the respondent Department. If the petitioners were aggrieved by the aforesaid policy decision taken by the Department in the year 1999, they ought to have approached the Tribunal within the time



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

as prescribed under the Central Administrative Tribunal Act. But they have not done so. Considering from any angle, there is no grounds to interfere with the order of the Tribunal. Consequently, there is no merit in the writ petitions. In fine, the writ petitions stand dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

[D.K.K., J.] [K.B., J.]
26.06.2024

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
mrn

To

- 1.The Chief Administrative Officer (P),
Personnel Division,
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre,
Central Complex,
Trombay,
Mumbai-400 085.
- 2.The Chief Administrative Officer,
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre Facilities,
Nuclear Recycle Board,
Kalpakkam-603 102.
3. The Registrar,
The Central Administrative Tribunal,
Madras Bench,
Chennai-600 104.

7/8



WEB COPY



WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16350 of 2024

D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.
and
K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

(mrn)

WP Nos.16355, 16358 and 16360 of 2024

26.06.2024