

(11)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.1624/99

New Delhi, this the 9th day of May, 2000.

HON'BLE MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)

1. Gian Chand, S/O Late Duni Chand Jhamb, R/O 425/19, Faridabad (Haryana).
2. Sh. Daljeet Singh, S/O Shri Gurbachan Singh, R/O L-57/A, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 17.
3. Sh. S.C.Malhotra, S/O Late Sh. K.L.Malhotra, R/O 28/T-III, PMT Staff Colony, BTPS Badarpur, New Delhi - 44.
4. Sh. Sultan Singh, S/O Late Sh. Dhian Singh, R/O 67/T-III, PMT Staff Colony, BTPS Badarpur, New Delhi - 44.
5. Sh. Radhey Lal, S/O Late Sh. Male Ram, R/O B-196, Addl. Township, BTPS, Badarpur, New Delhi - 44.
6. Sh. Lal Chand, S/O Late Sh. Balak Ram, R/O Vill. Alapur, P.O.Bharola, Teh. Palwal, Distt. Faridabad, Haryana.
7. Sh. K.Satish Pal, S/O Late Sh. C.S.Thakur, R/O K-20/F, Sheikh Sarai, Phase-II, New Delhi-17.
8. Km. S.Chatterjee, D/O Late Sh. K.N.Chatterjee, R/O Flat No.63, Pkt.D-6, Sector-IV, Rohini, Delhi-85.

.....Applicants.

(By Advocate: Sh. J.C.Malik)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through Secretary, Central Water Commission, Ministry of Water Resources, Govt. of India, Sewa Bhawan, R.K.Puram, New Delhi.
2. Union of India through Secretary, Deptt. of Power, C.E.A., Sewa Bhawan, R.K.Puram, New Delhi.

...Respondents.

(By Advocate: Sh. D.S.Mahendru)

18

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, M (J):

The applicants in this case have prayed for pension for the period served ^{by them} with the Central Water and Power Commission (CWPC), encashment of ~~the~~ leave and gratuity etc.

2. After hearing both the learned counsel for the parties for some time, I find that the applicants do not appear to have made any representation or at least no ^{copy} grounds of the same have been placed on record or even referred to in the pleadings.

3. Sh. J.C.Malik, learned counsel for applicants relies on the earlier order passed by the Tribunal in Smt. Arun Mehta & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors., (OA 2362/97), decided on 3.4.98 (copy placed on record). He claims that the applicants are similarly placed like the applicants in the other OA and hence they are also entitled to pro-rata pension and other benefits from the respondents for the service rendered by them.

4. Sh. D.S.Mahendru, learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that what was due to the applicants have also been paid to them. He has also submitted that the applicants have not stated clearly in the OA that they had earlier represented to the respondents to look into their grievance and as to how they are entitled for similar benefits as referred to by them in Smt. Arun Mehta & Ors. case (Supra). I have also seen the rejoinder filed by the applicants and I find force in

B.


the submissions made by Sh. D.S. Mahendru, learned counsel for respondents that the claims of the applicants have not been clearly spelt out either in the OA or in the rejoinder. In any case, it is also not clear as to what representation, if any, has been made by the applicants to the respondents.

5. In the above facts and circumstances, the OA is disposed of with the following directions:-

i) The applicants may submit a self-contained representation to the respondents to consider their claims, with full supporting documents for each of their claims;

ii) After receipt of the aforesaid representations of the applicants, the respondents shall proceed to take appropriate decision in the matter keeping in view the relevant rules and case law and dispose of the same by a reasoned and speaking order with intimation to the applicants.

No order as to costs.


(Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

/sunil/