

(16)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.NO. 1226/1999

New Delhi this the 29th day of November 2000

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)  
Hon'ble Mr. Govindan S. Tampi, Member(A)

1. Vishwanathan Kartha S/O Shri TNP Pillai  
HQ Technical Group EME Delhi Cantt6.
2. Ramesh Chander S/O Late Shri Chander  
Ballabh.
3. Smt. V.P. Thankamani Amma,  
W/O Sh. G Rameshan,
4. R V Ramana Murty S/O Sh. Kameshwara Rao,
5. T Parthasarthy s/o Sh T Gopala Rao
6. PVB Sharma S/O P. Suryanarayana
7. Ms Sumitra Kundra W/O Sh. S K Kundra
8. Gurbir Singh S/O Late Sh. Sarban Singh
9. R N Arora S/O Shri P D Arora
10. Mrs. Usha Chawla W/O Mr. S P Chawla  
(All are working as Stenographers in  
HQ Tech. Group, EME, Delhi Cantt)
11. Smt. Usha Taneja W/O Sh Lekh Raj
12. T M Abraham S/O Late Sh.
13. M Nathen
14. Y K Balasubramaniam S/O Hony. Capt.  
CA Hariharan.
15. Venugopalan S/O Late Sh.  
Kunjan Nair.
16. Jeevan Kumar S/O Late Sh. Jai  
Gopal

(All are working as Stenographers in 505,  
Army Base Workshop, Delhi Cantt).

(By Shri M K Bhardwaj, Advocate and proxy counsel  
Sh. A K Shastri Advocate).

Vs.

1. Union of India through The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi
2. The Director General EME(Civ.) MODs  
Branch, Army HQs. DHQ, PO New Delhi.
3. The Secretary, Govt of India, Min. of  
Personnel, Public Grievances and  
Pensions, Department of personnel & Trg.  
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
4. The Major General, (Commander)  
Takniki Group, Vaidyut aur Yantrik  
Ignyani Mukhalaya,  
HQs. Tech. Group, EME New Delhi.

..... Respondents

(P)

(By Shri Madhav Panikar, Advocate)

O R D E R (ORAL)

V. Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)

We do not find really any dispute in this case for the applicants who are Stenographers in EME. They seek to have their pay and allowances fixed in the scale of Rs.2000-3200 in parity with the pay scales of the officers to whom they are attached, from 1987 onwards, in terms of the DOPT's OM No. dated 6.2.89 as clarified subsequently. In O.A. No. 729/1992 in the matter of Shyam Jagannath Vaidya Vs Union of India, the Tribunal in its order dated 8.8.1995 has allowed such benefits in terms of OM dated 6.2.89. But on the representation dated 9.2.97, made by the applicants, the impugned order was passed rejecting the claim of the applicants.

2. The respondents do not dispute that the DOPT's OM dated 6.2.89 is applicable to the applicants in view of the judgement in Shyam Jagannath Vaidya (Supra).

3. The OA is therefore allowed. The impugned order is quashed. The respondents are directed to fix the pay of the applicants in terms of OM dated 6.2.89 with effect from date of the OM but since the applicants approached the Tribunal much later they are entitled for arrears only pay from 7.2.97.

(Govindan S Tampa)  
Member (A)

Patwari

(V. Rajagopala Reddy)  
VC(J)

Om Prakash