
(2018) 04 DEL CK 0220
In the Delhi High Court
Case No : W.P.(C) 3972 of 2018

BAJAJI D AND ANR

APPELLANT

Vs

AIR INDIA ENGINEERING SERVICES LTD (AIESL) AND ANR

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 23-04-2018

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2018) 04 DEL CK 0220

Hon'ble Judges : SUNIL GAUR

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Suresh Tripathy, Suruchi Suri, Roshan Lal Goel, Rishesh Mani Tripathi

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

SUNIL GAUR ,J.

1.This Court vide order of 4th April, 2018 had directed first respondent to consider petitionersâ?? Representation of 22nd May, 2017 and 18th

January, 2018 regarding sending of petitioners on Director General Civil Aviation Approved B-1 course conducted by respondents.

2. Impugned order of 10th April, 2018 (Annexure P-5) decides petitionersâ?? Representation without addressing the issue raised in the

Representation. All that has been said in impugned rejection order (Annexure P-5) is that petitioners were inducted as AME-Trainees in JEOC (Jet

Engine Overhaul Complex) w.e.f. 27th July, 2017 and 29th July, 2017 and thereafter, they had undergone various specialized trainings pertaining to

JEOC, as detailed in impugned rejection order.

3.Learned counsel for petitioners submits that it has not been explained in impugned rejection as to why petitioners cannot be sent on B-1 Course and

petitionersâ?? prayer for imparting them training under B-1 Course has not been

addressed and that it has also not been explained in impugned

rejection order as to why petitioners cannot be transferred from JEOC to Line Maintenance.

4.Learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that although petitioners were appointed on the post of Trainee Aircraft Maintenance Engineer, but as

per appointment letter of 6th March, 2017, the Management of respondent reserved all rights to take any decision with regard to training and

appointment of petitioners as Aircraft Engineer, if so necessitated.Â

5.During the course of hearing, learned counsel for petitioners alleged discrimination by pointing out that Jadu Bansh Mishra and Rajesh Singh, who

are much junior to petitioners, have been sent to B-1 Course, but petitioners are being discriminated by not being sent on the said Course. It is clarified

by learned counsel for respondent No.1 that Jadu Bansh Mishra and Rajesh Singh were from Operations and not from JET Maintenance. Learned

counsel for petitioners submits that initially, Jadu Bansh Mishra and Rajesh Singh were in JET Operations and later on, they had been shifted to

Aircraft Maintenance and there is no reason why petitioners cannot be also shifted to Aircraft Maintenance.

6.Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order, I find that petitionersâ?? Representations (Annexure P-3) have not been duly considered as no

reason is given in impugned order as to why petitioners cannot be shifted from JEOC to Line Maintenance.Â

7.In view of aforesaid, impugned order (Annexure P-1) is set aside with direction to first respondent to reconsider petitionersâ?? Representations

(Annexure P-3) within a period of four weeks from today and convey the fate of Representations to petitioners within a week thereafter, so that they

may avail of the remedies as available in law, if need be.Â

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

Copy of this order be given dasti to counsel for the parties.Â Â Â Â

Â