

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

OA 2638/1999

10

New Delhi this the 25th day of January, 2001.

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

Shri Sheonandan Prasad,
S/o Sh. Gyan Prasad,
working as Plumber,
in the Central Road Research
Institute (C.S.I.R), Maintenance Office,
Maharani Bagh, New Delhi.

.Applicant

(None for the applicant)

VERSUS

1. Council of Scientific and
Industrial Research, Anusandhan Bhawan,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi through the
Joint Secretary (Admn.)

2. Director,
Central Road Research Institute,
P.O.C.R.R.I. Delhi-Mathura Road,
New Delhi.

.Respondents

(By Advocate Sh. V. K. Rao, learned counsel
through proxy counsel Ms. Anuradha
Priyadarshini)

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

In this application the applicant has impugned
the respondents' order dated 10.11.1999, which is in
reply to his representation.

2. As none has appeared for the applicant
even on the second call, we have perused the documents
on record and heard learned proxy counsel for the
respondents. This case has been listed at Serial No. 6
under regular matters and if the applicant wanted to
be heard he should have been present. It is further
noticed that even on the previous date when the case
was listed on 3.1.2001, none had appeared.

18-

(11)

3. Learned proxy counsel for the respondents has submitted that in another case filed by Shri Shahbudin Khan Vs. CRRRI (OA 25/2000) against the same respondents in which similar issues have been raised, the Tribunal was pleased to dismiss the petition by order dated 16.11.2000. We note that in the impugned order dated 10.11.1999 reasons have been given by the respondents as to how the assessment of the pay scale has been done. According to the applicant, he has been appointed on regular vacancy of Work Charged Plumber in accordance with the rules and he should have been given the benefit of the services in that capacity. We note from the reply filed by the respondents that they have given the benefit of counting the past service to the applicant in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions. We further note from the submissions made by the learned proxy counsel for the respondents that in a similar case the claim of the applicant has not been agreed to and perhaps, that is the reason why none has been appearing for the applicant on ^{repeated 18} ~~the previous~~ dates when the case has been listed for hearing.

4. In the above facts and circumstances of the case, OA fails and is dismissed as we do not find any good reasons to interfere in the impugned order dated 10.11.1999. No order as to costs.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member(A)

sk

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman(J)