

6

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

---

Regn.No.OA-1674/88

Date of decision 17/02/1989.

Shri Pyre Lal & Others

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India & Others

.....Respondents

For the petitioners

.....Shri V.P. Sharma,  
Advocate

For the respondents

.....Shri S.P. Saini,  
Proxy Counsel for  
Mrs. Shashi Kiran,  
Counsel for the  
respondents.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. P.K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

THE HON'BLE MR. P. SRINIVASAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

(The judgment of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble  
Shri P. Srinivasan, Administrative Member)

This application has come before us today for admission with notice to the respondents. Shri V.P. Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.P. Saini, proxy counsel for Mrs. Shashi Kiran, Counsel for the respondents have been heard. Shri Saini submits that the reply of the respondents is not yet ready. We find from the order sheet that the then counsel for the respondents

*P. Srinivasan*

submitted on 06-12-88 that the reply of the respondents had already been filed on 17.10.1988, but no such reply was found on the file. When the matter came up again on 20.1.89, the application which was posted for admission for that day, was adjourned at the request of Shri S.P. Saini, proxy counsel for the respondents. We find no justification for granting further time to the respondents to file their reply to the application as this is a very petty matter which can be disposed of at the stage of admission itself. We have, therefore, heard counsel for both sides on the merits of the application.

2. The applicants are working as Clerks in the office of the Assistant Engineer, Northern Railway, Rewari. The case of the applicants is that during the period from 1983 to 1987 they had put in additional work for which they were entitled to honorarium but their representation in this regard had gone unheeded.


3. We feel that the minimum that the respondents should do in this case is to consider the representation of each of the applicants and if it is found that they had put in additional work qualifying them for honorarium, to grant them the same in accordance with the rules. We, therefore, direct the respondents to dispose of the representations made by each of the applicants and if their claim is found to be acceptable, to grant them the appropriate honorarium as provided under the rules. This should be done within

P. Saini

8

4 months' from the date of receipt of this order.

4. The application is disposed of on the above terms at the admission stage itself leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

  
(P. SRINIVASAN)  
MEMBER (A)

  
(P.K. KARTHA)  
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)