

Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench

O.A.1564/2000

New Delhi, this the 19th day of January, 2001

Hon'ble Mr. V.K. Majotra, Member(A)
Hon'ble Mr. Shanker Raju, Member(J)

Ms. Laxmi Gupta,
D/o late Raghunath Prasad
R/o 475-B, 4th Avenue
Smith Road, Allahabad(UP)

....Applicant

(Appeared in person)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through the Secretary
Ministry of Railway
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
2. The Chairman, Railway Board
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
3. General Manager, Northern Railway
Baroda House, New Delhi
4. Divisional Railway Manager
Northern Railway, D.R.M. Office
Allahabad, UP
5. Sr. Divisional Mechanical Engineer
Northern Railway, D.R.M Office
Allahabad, UP

....Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri B.S. Jain)

ORDER (ORAL)

By Mr. V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

The applicant has assailed order dated 29.5.98 (Annexure A-1), whereby she was relieved of her work in view of changes in duty list of ministerial staff, namely, Shri Mansoor Ahmed, HC-Planning, Shri M.H. Mujahid, Senior Clerk and Km. Luxmi Gupta, Clerk Technical. It was also mentioned that order assigning work to the applicant would be issued separately. The applicant has submitted that she is entitled to the pay scale of Head Clerk since 1982, to the pay scale of Superintendent from 1990 till date.

9

2. The respondents have filed a short reply stating that the applicant has already filed O.A.2122/99 seeking the following reliefs:

- "(i) to quash the impugned order at Annexure - A1 as being arbitrary, discriminatory, unjust, unfair and illegal;
- (ii) to direct the respondents to promote the applicant to the post of Head Clerk from 1982, and for the post of Asstt. Superintendent from 1984, and on the post of Office Superintendent from 1990 with consequential relief;
- (iii) Cost of the present application; and
- (iv) Any other direction as may be deemed fit and proper under the facts and circumstances stated here in above."

3. It has been contended that pleadings in the O.A. are complete and the same has been admitted. The respondents have submitted that the reliefs claimed in the O.A. being the same as in O.A.2122/99, present O.A. should be dismissed in limine.

4. We have heard the applicant. Learned counsel Shri B.S.Jain appeared on behalf of respondents.

5. We find that the contention of the respondents that the reliefs claimed in both the OAs are the same, is borne out from the records. In this view of the matter, this O.A. is dismissed in limine.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

V.K. Majotra
(V.K. Majotra)
Member (A)

/dinesh/