

2

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

O.A. No. 2334/2002 &  
O.A. No. 2335/2002

This the 9th day of September, 2002

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

**OA No. 2334/2002**

Shri Satish Chander Khosla  
S/o Shri B.C. Khosla  
R/o B-3/6B, Lawrence Road,  
Delhi-110035.

(By Advocate: Shri K.K. Patel)

-Applicant

Versus

Union of India through-

1. The Secretary,  
Department of Revenue  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

2. The Chairman  
Department of Revenue  
Central Board of Direct Taxes  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

-Respondents

**OA No. 2335/2002**

Shri Ghevar Chand Jain,  
S/o Shri Nathu Lal Jain,  
R/o SL-6, Income Tax Colony,  
Tonk Road, Jaipur-302018  
at present at New Delhi  
C/o H 6/10, Malaviya Nagar,  
New Delhi-17.

(By Advocate: Shri K.K. Patel)

-Applicant

Versus

Union of India through-

1. The Secretary,  
Department of Revenue  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

2. The Chairman  
Department of Revenue  
Central Board of Direct Taxes  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

-Respondents

3

-2-  
ORDER (Oral)

Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal:

By this common order, these two OAs 2334/2002 and 2335/2002 can conveniently be disposed of together.

2. For the sake of convenience, we are taking a few facts from the petition of Satish Chander in OA No.2334/2002.

3. The applicant <sup>was</sup> first promoted as Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax and worked there till December, 1995. On 1.12.1995, he was promoted as Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax and continued to work in the said post till he retired on 31.7.2002.

4. The grievance of the applicant is that he became eligible for promotion as Joint Commissioner of Income Tax but respondents did not convene the Departmental Promotion Committee (DPC) meeting for considering the case of the applicant for the above said post. We are told at the Bar that the inter-se-seniority dispute has since been ~~resolved~~ dissolved.

5. At this stage, it becomes unnecessary to issue any notice to the respondents because their rights are not likely to be affected. It is directed that the respondent No.2 should convene the meeting of the DPC considering the applicants, if eligible and other eligible persons as per rules and appropriate order be passed in accordance with law. This exercise preferably should be completed within

*MS Ag*

six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. By way of abundant caution, it is stated that nothing has been stated on the merits of these cases.

(V.K. Majotra)  
Member (A)

cc.

(V.S. Aggarwal)  
Chairman

Attested  
Aggarwal  
CO.CI