

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP.No.441 of 2000

in

OA.No.1229 of 1996

New Delhi, this 27th day of November 2000

(20)

HON'BLE SHRI KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE SHRI M.P. SINGH, MEMBER(A)

1. A.K. Sethi

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

2. S.K. Arora

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

3. Mangat Rai

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi

4. N.S.Duggal

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi

5. Gurdip Singh

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

6. V.K. Behl

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi

7. Om Prakash

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

8. Ramesh Kumar

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi

K

9. N.N. Khanna

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

10. K.L. Arora

Planning Draftsman (Sr.)
Town & Country Planning Organisation
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi

... Petitioners

(By Advocate: Shri Dhanesh Relan)

versus

1. Shri N.N. Mukherjee

Secretary
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi-110011

2. Shri D.S. Meshram

Chief Planner
Town & Country Planning Organisation
E-Block
Vikas Bhawan
New Delhi-110002

3. Shri C.M. Vasudeva

Secretary
Department of Expenditure
Ministry of Finance
North Block
New Delhi-110001

... Respondents

ORDER(Oral)

Hon'ble Shri Kuldip Singh, M(J)

Heard learned counsel for petitioners in
C.P.

2. The Tribunal in its order dated 8.2.2000
in OA.1229/96 has passed the following
directions:

"Respondents to consider granting
revision of pay scale to the
applicants in this O.A. in terms of
Para 4 of the O.M. dated 19.10.1994,
keeping in view the aforesaid

K

22

observations. The applicants shall be given the benefit of revised pay scale as Senior Planning Draftsmen as given to other similarly situated Draftsmen Grade-I, but the monetary benefit will be given only from the date when the concerned benefit will be given only from the date when the concerned person was appointed/promoted in that grade on or after 1.11.1983."

3. In compliance to the above directions, the respondents, have examined the representation of the petitioners and passed the order dated 24.8.2000 whereby they have stated that the post of Draftsmen Grade-I in TCPO cannot be compared with that of Draftsmen Grade-I in CPWD. The method of recruitment, educational qualifications and experience and duties and responsibilities prescribed for the post of Planning Draftsmen in TCPO are not at par with Draftsman Grade-I in CPWD. The hierarchical structure in TCPO is also not comparable with that of CPWD. The Fifth Pay Commission has also not made nay specific recommendation for the post of Planning Draftsmen in TCPO. Besides this, if the scales sought for is granted, it will destroy the relative parity in scales and hierarchy of the posts in TCPO. The O.M. dated 19.10.1994 is not applicable to Planning Draughtsmen in TCPO and they cannot be given the pay scale of Rs.1600-1660 with effect from 1.1.1986 and Rs.5500-900 with effect from 1.1.1996.

4. We are satisfied that the directions given by the Tribunal has been complied with since the

Am

(23)

respondents have disposed of the representation of the petitioners by passing a speaking order. No contempt is made out. CP is disposed of. No costs.

mfp

(M.P. Singh)
Member(A)

Kuldeep

(Kuldeep Singh)
Member(J)

dbc