

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 4181 OF 2004

C.S.I.R. & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

RATNA CHATTERJEE & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for extension of time and prayer for interim relief
and office report)

Date: 30/09/2010 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER SINGH NIJJAR

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Praveen Swarup,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Adv.
Mr. T.V.S. Raghavendra Sreyas, Adv.
Mr. Gautam Narayan, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Menon, Adv.
Mrs. Sumita Ray,Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Nayyar ,Adv

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The appeal is allowed without any order as to
costs in terms of the signed order.

(DEEPAK MANSUKHANI)
Court Master

(RENUKA SADANA)
Court Master

(The signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4181 OF 2004

C.S.I.R. & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

RATNA CHATTERJEE & ANR.

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Pursuant to the directions of this Court dated 24th February, 2010, the appellant Council of Scientific and Industrial Research(CSIR) having reconsidered the entire issue disposed of the representation made by the respondent no. 1 vide its order dated 10th May, 2010. The said order is self-explanatory. The appellant, on reassessing the entire situation, squarely addressed the question as to whether the case of the respondent no. 1 is similarly situated to that of Dr. Tripti Dey and Ms. Nandita Singh. It is clearly explained that in case of Dr. Tripti Dey, she has more than 15 years research experience and even during the gap period, she was availing post-Doctoral fellowship, of course, not in the CSIR but in a foreign university. The fact remains that she continued with her research work even during the gap period. Similar is the case of Ms. Nandita Singh. In the circumstances, the respondent no. 1 cannot compare herself with the case of Dr. Tripti Dey and Ms. Nandita Singh, in whose case, the appellant herein have granted some relaxation. No

-2-

other point arises for consideration in this case. The order passed on 10th May, 2010 completely answers the issue raised by the respondent no. 1. We find no infirmity in the order and reasons assigned by the appellant in its order dated 10th May, 2010.

For the aforesaid reasons, it is not possible to give any relief to the respondent no. 1. The impugned order of the High Court is accordingly set aside and the appeal is accordingly allowed without any order as to costs.

.....J.
(B. SUDERSHAN REDDY)

.....J.
(SURINDER SINGH NIJJAR)

September 30, 2010.