

C

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No.1552 of 2001

New Delhi, this the 26th day of November, 2001

HON'BLE MR.S.A.T.RIZVI, MEMBER (A)

K.L. Dutta,
S/o late Shri Dina Nath Dutta
R/o J-101, Vikas Puri,
New Delhi-110018.
(By Advocatoos Shri P.R.~ Madhavan)

...Applicant.

Versus

1. The Controller General of Defence Accounts
West Block No.V,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110066.
 2. Controller of Defence Accounts,
Army,
Meerut Cantt.(U.P).
 3. Union of India
Through Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel, Public
Grievances and Pensions,
Department of Pensions and
Pensioners Welfare,
North Block, New Delhi-110001.
 4. The Principal Controller of
Defence Accounts(Pensions)
Dropti Ghat,
Alahabad (U.P.)-211 001.
 5. The Chairman & Managing Director,
National Hydro-electric Power Corporation Ltd.,
(A Govt. of India Enterprises),
Sector-33, Faridabad.
Haryana.
- ...Respondents.
- (By Advocate: Shri Neeraj Goyal, proxy counsel)
Ms.Anuradha Priyadarshini, Respondent No.5

O R D E R(ORAL)

By Hon'ble Sh.S.A.T.Rizvi. Member(A)

Heard the learned counsel on either side.

2. The relief sought in the OA has been granted on 12.9.2001 by revising the PPO earlier issued. Hence, the OA does not survive any longer. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, however, submits that in the circumstances of this case, costs must be imposed on the respondents for the delay that has taken

d

(2)

place in revising the PPO. According to him, applicant's age is 80 years and the matter which needed to be resolved is a very small matter which could have been decided promptly enough after the applicant filed his representation on 7.10.999. The respondents have, nevertheless, taken two years' time to redress applicant's grievance.

3. I have considered the submissions made by both the parties and find that, having regard to the age of the applicant, the respondents should have decided the matter which indeed is a small matter promptly and in a month at best. For taking two years in the matter, the respondents are found to be guilty of gross delay which is just too bad and is unacceptable. I, therefore, direct that cost quantified at Rs.1000/- be imposed on the respondents to be paid by them to the applicant within a month from today.

4. The present OA is disposed of in the aforestated terms.


(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member(A)

/kd/