

(1)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 908/1995

New Delhi this the 19th Day of May 1995

Hon'ble Mr. A.V. Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Mr. K. Muthukumar, Member (A)

Shri Jai Prakash
S/o Shri Sita Ram,
Resident of WZ 525 Nangal Raya,
New Delhi-110 046. ... Applicant

(By Advocate: In Person)

Vs

1. Govt. of N.C.T. Delhi,
through Chief Secretary,
Govt. of NCT,
Shyam Nath Marg,
Delhi.
2. The Director of Education,
Directorate of Education,
Old Secretariat, Delhi.
3. Union of India,
Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Human Resources Development,
New Delhi. ... Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

Hon'ble Mr. A.V. Haridasan, Vice Chairman

We have heard the applicant who is present in person and we have also gone through the facts stated in the application. The grievance of the applicant is that the applicant and others who are trained graduate teachers have been discriminated in the matter of pay scales while a higher pay scale has been given to the Physical Education Teacher Grade I vide Officer Order No. 3 dated 2.3.1995 (Annexure A-1). The other grievance of the applicant is that he came to know from the TV that Department has curtailed summer vacation of the teachers as they are going to reopen the school after summer vacation on 3.7.1995 while normally the reopening should be

✓

on 15.7.1995. The applicant has not placed any order in this regard. First of all these two prayers which are totally unrelated to each other cannot be combined in one application. However, if either of this relief could be granted, the applicant could have been asked to elect and the application could be admitted in regard to the elected relief. But, the applicant had made a representative in regards to the disparity in the pay scale only after 2.3.1995. He should have waited for six months to see whether the department would concede his demand and then only approached the Tribunal. So the application in regard to that relief is premature and cannot be admitted. Basing on some information alleged to have been gathered from a news item in the television, the applicant has rushed to the Tribunal. ~~On this score also we do not find that any cause of action has accrued~~ ^{in our} of the considered view that the application does not merit admission. Hence the same is rejected under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act.


(K. Muthukumar)

Member (A)


(A.V. Haridasan)

Vice Chairman(J)

Mittal