

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

D.A. No. 2589/96

New Delhi: this the 12 day of May, 2000.

(13)

Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)

Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)

Shri G.R. Balodhi,
S/o Late Gobind Ram Balodhi,

Working as Technical Officer in
the Central Building Research Institute (CSIR)
Roorkee (UP)Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri K.N. Bahuguna)

Versus

1. Council of Scientific &
Industrial Research

"Anusandhan Bhawan",
Rafi Marg,
New Delhi-1

2. Director,
Central Building Research Institute,
Roorkee (UP)Respondents

(None appeared)

ORDER

MR. S.R. ADIGE, VC(A)

Applicant seeks a direction for payment of honoraria/consultancy for the work done by him as a team member from 1986 till 1996 i.e. till the completion of project @ Rs. 15,000/- per year for the years 1986, 1987 and 1988; and @ Rs. 50,000/- per year for the years 1989; 1990; 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994 as has been granted to other similarly situated in the Navodaya Vidyalaya Project.

2. We have heard applicant's counsel Shri Bahuguna. None appeared for respondents. As this is a very old case we are disposing it off after perusing the materials on record and hearing Shri Bahuguna.

✓

(A)

3. Respondents in their reply state that applicant fell under the category of supporting staff as he belongs to Group II Scientific and Technical Stream of Respondent Institute. They state that the issue of distribution of honoraria was referred to a Committee constituted to look into the grievances of beneficiaries/claimants of honoraria/consultancy. Applicant appeared before the Committee and after hearing him, the Committee recommended that he may be paid an additional amount of Rs.10,000/- only. Applicant was sanctioned Rs.10,000/- but he refused to accept the same. They state that the pattern of distribution of honorarium was as follows:

Team of Consultants	=	65%
Other S & Tech. Staff.	=	15%
Supporting Staff	=	15%
CSIR Welfare Fund	=	5%

4. These assertions of respondents in their reply have not been challenged or denied by applicant in any rejoinder.

5. In the light of the foregoing facts, no case has been made out by applicant to warrant interference in this OA which is dismissed. No costs.


(KULDIP SINGH)
MEMBER (J)


(S.R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

/ug/