

DRAFT

4

Azad Singh

Versus

... Respondents

Shri M. L. Verma, Counsel for the Respondents

Hon'ble Shri Justice U. C. Srivastava, V.C.(J)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice U. C. Srivastava, V.C.)

The applicant has been working as-a Projectionist in the Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital which comes under the Director General of Health Services since 1982 in the scale of Rs.260-400. The applicant ~~alleges~~ ^{alleges} that similarly placed persons in the Safdarjung Hospital get a higher ~~placed~~ pay scale than that in the Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital. It is further stated that the duties and responsibilities attached to the post in both the Hospitals are identical and the eligibility conditions in both the Hospitals are the same. The applicant represented against the same several times. A copy of his representation dated 4.9.1989 is annexed with the CA as Annexure -III. ~~XXXXXX to his representation~~ ^{to} The Administrative Officer of the Hospital, vide his letter dated 21.3.1989 (Annexure-IV) addressed to the Director General of Health Services, New Delhi made a reference to respondent No.2 pointing out the anomaly in the pay scale. It is stated that no action has been taken by

respondents thereafter. It is conveyed in the above letter that the applicant possesses the qualification ~~an~~ for the post of Projectionist; that the duties and responsibilities of the post and ^{and experience} qualifications/prescribed, in the recruitment rules of the incumbents are identical. The pay scale for the said post in RML Hospital is Rs.950-1500 whereas in Safdarjung Hospital the same is Rs.1350-2200 and that there appears to be some clerical error. It is suggested in the letter that the case may be included in the list of categories of posts by the Anomalies Committee .

2. It appears that no action has been taken by the respondents thereafter. Applicant's averment that the duties and responsibilities of the above post in both the Hospitals are identical are similar cannot, therefore, be denied. It is stated that the matter is still under consideration of the respondents. More than two years have ~~been~~ passed since then. ~~xxxxxxx~~ The case, therefore, calls interference from the Tribunal and we direct the respondents that the applicant's claim may be decided within a period of three months either by referring the matter to the Anomalies Committee or by the respondent No.2 himself.. This period of three months will be counted from the date of communication of a copy of this order.

The OA is disposed of as above with no order as to costs.

(U. C. Srivastava)
V.C.(J)

4/12/51
(Kaushal Kumar)
V.C.(A)