

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

O.A. 1690/96

New Delhi this the 12th day of February, 1997

Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J).

S.D. Sharma,
S/o Shri L.R. Sharma,
R/o 9993, Sarai Rohilla,
New Rohtak Road,
New Delhi.

...Applicant.

In person

Versus

1. Chief Secretary,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
5, Sham Nath Marg,
Delhi.
2. Union of India through
Under Secretary,
Department of Expenditure,
Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India,
8th Floor Lok Nayak Bhawan,
Khan Market,
New Delhi.
3. Controller of Accounts,
Principal Accounts Office,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Gokhle Marg,
Mori Gate,
Delhi.
4. Director of Education,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Old Secretariat,
Delhi.
5. Drawing and Disbursing Officer,
Govt. Boys Senior Secondary School,
Rohtak Road,
New Delhi.

...Respondents.

(through Shri T.N. Bhardwaj, Office Supdt., departmental official)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J).

The departmental representative on behalf of the respondents has made a statement today which is taken on record, that the applicant has been paid the CDS amount of Rs.734/- as Principal and Rs.1864/- as interest upto the date of realisation of the bill. The applicant has also filed a statement today which is also taken on record

4

admitting these facts and states that the application regarding prayer at para 8(1) has, therefore, become infructuous. The applicant has, however, submitted that because of the delay in settling the matter, he should be paid a sum of Rs.10,000/- by way of compensation/damages to meet the ends of justice.

2. The applicant has admittedly retired as Teacher w.e.f. 1.8.1990 and this O.A. has been filed on 6.8.1996. He states that he had made representations regarding these amounts as far as back in 1993 and the compensation/damages is in respect of 13 years delay.

3. Having considered the above facts, the entire fault regarding delay cannot be attributed solely to the respondents and, therefore, there seems to be no justification for awarding the damages/compensation prayed for. This prayer is accordingly rejected.

4. Having regard to the above facts, the other claims having already been satisfied, this O.A. is disposed of as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member(J)

'SRD'