

(7)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

O.A.No.799/97

Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 16th day of January, 1998

Sh. Mahesh Chand Sharma
S/o. Sh. Niranjana Lal Sharma
R/o. 406 F, Pocket II, Phase Ist
Mayur Vihar, Delhi - 110091.

APPLICANT

(by Sh.U. Srivastava, Advocate)

Versus

Union of India

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting,
Govt. of India.

2. The Director
C.P.C. Doordarshan,
Asiad Village,
New Delhi.

3. The Administrative Officer
C.P.C. Doordarshan,
Asiad Village,
New Delhi.

RESPONDENTS

(by Sh.S.Mohd. Arif, Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

The applicant is aggrieved by the action of the respondents which are not making re-imbusement ~~of~~ the medical expenses incurred by him. According to him, the claim for medical re-imbusement was made on 7.5.96. Till the date of filing of the OA i.e., on 7.4.97, the payment had not been made.

2. The respondents in their reply have stated that the payment could not be made as the applicant had not submitted the original cash memos along with his claim. In this context they draw attention to the letter of the Administrative Officer, Central Production Centre, Doordarshan, 18.3.97 at Annexure-RII, whereby the applicant had been asked to submit the original cash memos. The respondents also say that the payment of the medical re-imbusement claim was made on 10.4.97 as per Annexure-RI.

JL

8

3. Today when the matter came up Sh.U. Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant admitted that the payment of the claim had been made on 10.4.97. Sh. Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the respondents had unnecessarily caused delay and forced the applicant to approach this Tribunal for obtaining relief. Sh.S.Mohd. Arif, learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submits that it was the applicant himself who on account of the mis-behaviour with the Administrative Officer and due to non submission of the original cash memos, had caused the delay himself.

4. The OA has become infructuous as the necessary relief has been granted to the applicant. However, I consider that the applicant is entitled to the cost as the respondents have taken almost a year in making the payment. Even their query about the original cash memos was raised after a gap of eight months. The applicant would therefore be entitled to cost which I assess at Rs.500/-(Five Hundred Only).

R.K. Ahuja
(R.K. AHUJA)
MEMBER(A)

/PB/