

(4)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No. 2582/2001

New Delhi this the 19th day of February, 2002

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)  
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S.Tampi, Member (A)

Hari Prakash Pandey,  
S/O Shri R.D.Pandey,  
working as Asstt.Librarian,  
Central Libraryt, Lady  
Hardinge and Smt.S.K.Hospital,  
New Delhi  
R/O C-8/80, Sector-15,  
Rohini, Delhi-110085

..Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Ajit Pudusser )

VERSUS

1. The Union of India through  
Secretary, Ministry of  
Health and Family Welfare,  
Govt.of India, Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
2. The Director General Health  
Health Svrcies, Govt.of India,  
Ministry of Health and Family  
Welfare, Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
3. The Principal,  
Lady Hardinge Medical College  
and Associated Hospitals  
New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri N.S.Mehta, learned  
senior counsel )

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)

In this application the applicant is aggrieved by  
non - implementation of the recommendations of the Review  
Committee on Library Staff which according to the learned  
counsel for the appliccant had been accepted by the  
respondents by order dated 24.7.1990.

18/2

2. The applicant has also submitted that in a similar cases, for example, in OA 2678/1997 which was disposed of by Tribunal's order dated 6.7.2000 the Library staff working in other Institutions have been given the same relief.

3. The respondents have filed reply on 12.2.2002 in which they have taken a preliminary objection that the application is barred by limitation. However, in Paragraph 12 of the reply, they have stated that the restructuring of the Library cadre is under examination of the competent authority which is within the knowledge of the applicant. They have also submitted that the examination of the issue ~~re~~ involves recommendation of the Review Committee of 1990 as well as the subsequent recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission. In the circumstances, they have prayed that they may be given sufficient time to examine the case of each staff in the Library of ~~the~~ <sup>by</sup> Institution in detail as the very issue raised by the applicant is under their active consideration. Shri N.S.Mehta, learned senior counsel prays that at least three months may be granted to the respondents to take appropriate decision in the matter.

4. Taking into account the relevant facts and circumstances of the case, briefly mentioned above, the particular objection of the application being barred by ~~by~~ limitation has not been pressed by the respondents and cannot also be done in the light of their own averments in Para 12 of their reply.

18.

5. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to take appropriate decision in the matter with regard to the applicant, who is part of the library staff of Respondent No.3 in the light of the recommendations of the Review Committee given in 1990 and the Vth Pay Commission and other relevant factors, within three months from today. In case the claims of the applicant for redesignation/revision of pay and arrears of pay are rejected by the respondents, this shall be done by a detail, speaking and reasoned order, with intimation to the applicant. No costs.

( Govindan S.Tampi )  
Member (A)

sk

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