

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. 906/94

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1994

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member(J)

Shri M.C. Arora,  
s/o Shri Mool Chand Arora,  
Aged about 58 years  
R/o DG-804, Sarojini Nagar,  
New Delhi.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Shri B.B. Raval)

Vs.

1. Union of India  
through the Secretary  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Govt. of India,  
North Block,  
New Delhi.
2. The Director,  
Intelligence Bureau,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Govt. of India,  
North Block,  
New Delhi.
3. Shri Kashmiri Lal,  
Asstt. Central Intelligence  
Officer Grade II (Retired)  
C/o Director, Intelligence Bureau,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Govt. of India,  
North Block,  
New Delhi.
4. Shri Manak Chand,  
Assistant Central Intelligence  
Officer Grade II  
in the Intelligence Bureau,  
C/o The Director,  
Intelligence Bureau,  
Govt. of India,  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(Shri Hari Shankar, Proxy for  
Shri Madhu Panikar)

O R D E R

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member(J)

The applicant had the grievance regarding correct  
fixation of his pay on the ground of his seniority which

...2..

22

(A)

has been allowed to him in spite of repeated representations and therefore he filed the present application praying for the grant of the relief that his pay be fixed at par with his juniors on the date of absorption with all consequential benefits as well as his superannuation benefits be stopped up alongwith all DCRT. He has also prayed for the grant of the interest as well as costs.

2. Shri Hari Shankar, appeared as Proxy for Shri Madhav Panikar and stated that after filing of this application the applicant has been granted the relief for the re-fixation of the pay and the pensionary benefits has also been revised. As such the grievance has been meted out except regarding the interest. The applicant is also present alongwith the counsel and he is satisfied with the aforesaid order except that because of the delayed payment, the interest be allowed.

3. Regarding payment of interest to the applicant there is no administrative lapse on the part of the respondents inasmuch as the applicant himself pointed out the discrepancy in his pay and that of a junior Shri Kashmiri Lal in 1989. The respondents have taken the steps and by the order dated June 1993 certain queries were asked by subsidiary Intelligence Bureau from ADE, IB Hqrs., New Delhi. The applicant against that filed a representation and when he did not get any reply he filed this application in April, 1994. The respondents did not contest the application and made the payments to the applicant. In view of this the applicant is not entitled to any interest.

4. The application is therefore disposed of as infructuous with no order as to cost.

*Domare*  
(J.P. Sharma)  
Member (J)