

17

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.1593/2000

New Delhi, this 20th day of December, 2001

Hon'ble Shri M.P. Singh, Member(A)

Daya Ram Singh Chauhan
Chowkidar, Dte. of Census Operations
Delhi

.. Applicant

(By Shri A.K.Trivedi, Advocate)

versus

1. Secretary
M/Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi
2. Registrar General of India
2A, Man Singh Road, New Delhi
3. Director of Census Operations
Old Secretariat, Delhi

.. Respondents

(By Shri K.R. Sachdeva, Advocate)

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the parties. By the present OA, the applicant working as Chowkidar under R-3, seeks directions to the respondents to pay him uniform allowance for the period from 1983 to 1987, OTA for working half-an-hour daily in excess of the normal office hours for the period from 20.4.90 to 30.6.1998 and stitching charges of uniform w.e.f. 1983 till date.

2. On the other hand, it is the case of the respondents that the applicant had neither submitted any claim of OTA for the period from 20.4.90 to 22.4.94 nor objected about his working hours at the time of issuance of revised office order beyond the limitation period. It is also the case of the respondents that the working hours of the applicant were corrected by order dated 21.2.94 from 8.30 AM to 5 PM instead of 8 AM to 5 PM but




18

2

the applicant refused the receive that order. As per Rules for claiming OTA, a government servant has to get prior permission from the competent authority for performing overtime duty and submit his claim in the following month. Applicant has failed to submit any such document in support of his claim. As regards uniform allowance, as the applicant was under suspension during the year 1983-87 and he was not expected to wear uniform for that period, he was not paid that allowance as per Rules on the subject. As regards stitching charges, the applicant had submitted a bill for Rs.150/- in the year 1991 and when he was paid maximum of Rs.130/- as admissible under Rules, he refused to accept the same and thereafter he did not submit any bill. However, learned counsel for the respondents would contend that if the applicant submits the bill for stitching charges, the same would be settled as per rules on the subject.

3. In view of the above position, I find nothing survives in the present OA and the same is dismissed accordingly. No costs.


(M.P. Singh)
Member(A)

/gtv/