

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA-2092/2002

This the 8th day of August, 2002

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice-Chairman (J)  
Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

1. Mangal Singh, SFA
2. Murari Lal, SFA
3. Rajendra Prasad, SFA
4. Ram Bhaj, SFA
5. Rup Chand, AFO
6. Amar Singh, SFA(MT)
7. Dan Singh Bisht, SFA(MT)
8. Pritam Singh, SFA
9. Lala Ram, SFA
10. M.S.Sisodia, SFA
11. Viajay Pal Singh, AFO
12. Jai Pal Singh, AFO
13. Dev Giri, SFA (MT)
14. Sri Ram Singh, SFA (MT)
15. Jagdish, SFA
16. R.S. Rawat, SFA (MT)
17. Somraj Kristan SFA (MT),
18. Bale Ram, SFA
19. Om Prakash, SFA.

-Applicants

(All the applicants are working in the  
office of Respondents No.2)

(By Advocate: Shri M.K. Gupta)

Versus

1. Union of India,  
Through the Secretary (R),  
Cabinet Secretariat,  
7, Bikaner House (Annexe),  
Shahjahan Road,  
New Delhi-110003.
2. Special Secretary-I,  
Cabinet Secretariat,  
7, Bikaner House (Annexe),  
Shahjahan Road,  
New Delhi-110003.

-Respondents

ORDER (Oral)

Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

Shri M.K. Gupta, learned counsel heard.

2. Applicants are presently working in various

Vb

capacities with the office of respondent No.2 from the various dates mentioned in Annexure A-1 as Senior Field Assistant (SFA) and two of the applicants are Assistant Field Officer (AFO). These applicants are aggrieved that they have been denied the revised pay scale on the ground of differential in qualification, i.e., the applicants being non-matriculates as also the benefit of the order passed by this Tribunal (Cuttack Bench) in OA-57/86 dated 20.2.92 and order dated 18.5.2001 made by Principal Bench of this Tribunal in OAs 1107 & 1223/2000 and OA-130/2001 and order dated 6.6.2002 in OA-3382/2001. Learned counsel stated that respondents have rejected representation of the applicants stating that the matter regarding extension of benefit of CAT judgment to Non-Matric FAs had been taken up with Ministry of Finance. However, it has been decided by respondents that such benefit could be accorded only to petitioners in those cases and is not automatically extendable to the non-petitioners. Learned counsel has drawn our attention to paragraph 4 (i) of the OA regarding representation having been made by the applicants to respondents.

3. We find that applicants have neither annexed copy of their representation nor mentioned the date of representation in the OA.

4. Having regard to the averments made in the OA, in our view the ends of justice would be met if at this stage itself and without issuing a notice to the respondents, we ask the applicants to make separate detailed representations referring to the judgments relied upon by them, which

W

respondents should consider and pass appropriate orders within a month. *Ordered accordingly.*

5. O.A. is disposed of in the aforesated terms. No costs.

V.K. Majotra  
(V.K. Majotra)  
Member (A)

cc.

Lakshmi Swaminathan  
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Vice-Chairman (J)