

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

8
(A)

OA NO. 1147/99
NEW DELHI THIS THE 2nd DAY OF November, 1999

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)
HON'BLE MRS. SHANTA SHASTRY, MEMBER (A)

In the matter of:

S. Zafar Husain,
S/O Sri Nazar Husain,
R/O House No. 604-A, Sector-3,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-22
(By Advocate: Dr. Sumant Bhardwaj)

....Applicant

Vs.

1. Sh. Sikandar Lal for
Director of Public Grievance,
Ministry of Personnel, P.G. & Pensions,
Deptt. of Personnel and Training,
North Block, New Delhi - 110011.

2. Director of Information
and Publicity,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Block No. 9, Old Secretariat,
Delhi-54.

.... Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. K.K. Singh proxy for
Sh. Raj Singh)

O R D E R (ORAL)

BY REDDY. J.

Heard the counsel for the applicant and the respondents.

2. The OA is filed to implement the decision of the Tribunal in OA No. 2540/96 dated 19.9.97. The case of the applicant was that he was Urdu Translator and he worked for some time in the post of Sub-Editor and Assistant Information Officer on ad hoc basis and thereafter he was reverted from Assistant Information Officer to the post of Urdu Translator in Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. In the above OA it was directed that the case of the applicant will be considered for promotion to the post of Sub-Editor subject to the eligibility and also consider the case with the question of reviving one of the posts of Sub-Editor in case the same can also be justified on the basis of work load. And consider amending

CA

the relevant Recruitment Rules to bring the post of Urdu Translator also into the feeder category for promotion. It is the grievance of the applicant that these directions have not been complied with. In the counter affidavit he has stated that the post of Sub-Editor was ~~being~~ abolished in May 1994 and hence the decision of promotion of the applicant to the said post could not be made. It is also stated that the work load did not warrant the revival of the post of Sub-Editor ~~and~~ ² as to the amendment of the Recruitment Rules, it was not found justified. Hence, it was stated that the applicant was not given any benefit under the judgment.

3. Learned counsel for applicant, however, submits that he had already worked in the post of Assistant Information Officer in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the applicant may be considered for promotion to the post of Assistant Information Officer. It is also contended that this post is identical with the post of Sub-Editor hence the applicant is entitled to the post of Assistant Information Officer. We find some force in this contention. It is not disputed that the applicant has been earlier working in the post of Assistant Information Officer during the period from 5.10.87 to 13.11.91. In the circumstances we direct Resp. No.2 to consider the case of the applicant for promotion to the post of Assistant Information Officer in the ^{Government of National Capital Territory of} ~~Ministry of~~ Delhi, if the post is identical and if the applicant is found eligible for such promotion. (X)

4. The OA is accordingly disposed of.

Shanta Shastri
(MRS. SHANTA SHASTRY)
Member (A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY)
Vice Chairman (J)

'sd'

④ Corrected vide Court's
order dated 8.3.2000