

ITEM NO.104

COURT NO.13

SECTION XVI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 10397/2011

MANJUSHA KUMARI

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 20-07-2023 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.K. MAHESHWARI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHANFor Appellant(s) Mr. Shree Prakash Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Shekhar Kumar, AOR
Mr. Vijay Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Janme Jay, Adv.
Mr. Nawalendra Kumar, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, AOR
Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Ritesh Patil, Adv.
Mr. Yogesh Yadav, Adv.Mr. Bharath Sood, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Anand, Adv.
Mr. Navanjay Mahapatra, Adv.
Mr. Padmesh Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Rustam Singh Chauhan, Adv.
Mr. Anuj Udappa, Adv.
Mr. Shantanu Sharma, Adv.
Mr. G. S. Makker, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AORUPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The service of Respondent No. 4 on the post of E.D.B.P.M. was terminated after an order dated 06.12.2004 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal [in short, "C.A.T."], which was set aside by the High Court by the impugned Judgment dated 08.03.2010.

On account of passing an order of stay by this Court, it is

said that the appellant is working. It is also a fact that Respondent No. 4 was appointed on 31.12.1997 and therefore, she has worked upto the order of C.A.T.. As per instructions of learned counsel appearing for Union of India, the appellant and Respondent No. 4 are still working.

Considering the aforesaid, we think it appropriate to observe that the learned counsel for Union of India shall seek instructions in the matter as to whether they can accommodate the appellant and Respondent No. 4, both looking to their experience on the same post.

Let the needful be done within three weeks.

Re-list on 23.08.2023.

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(VIRENDER SINGH)
BRANCH OFFICER