

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

REGN. NO. OA 28/88

Date of Decision 8.1.1988

Shri Manohar Lal & others Applicants

Vs.

Union of India & Others Respondents

CORAM:- Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.D. Jaing, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Birbal Nath, Administrative Member.

For the applicants Shri P.P. Juneja, Advocate
For the respondents Nemo.

O R D E R

The applicants in this case are employed as Field Assistant/Sample Packer in the Department of Prevention of Food Adultration, Delhi Administration, which is a class IV post carrying the pay-scale of Rs. 196-3-220-EB-3-232, as per recruitment rules (Annexure III) to the application. They seeks eq-uation and parity with another class of officials called Field Assistant /Packer in the unit for the Prevention of Food Adultration in the Directorate General of Health Services, which is a class III post and carries the pay scale of Rs.260-6-300-EB-8-340-380-EB-10-430. The contention is that the applicants are doing similar type of work and discharging the same nature of duties which are being discharged by Field Assistant Class III. However, we notice that the essential Educational qualifications for Field Assistant in Class III is Higher Secondary with Science Subjects and experience in field work being desirable. However, it is not so in the case of the applicants for whom the educational qualification is just Matric/High School from any

contd...

recognised institute/Board and the desirable qualification is experience of sealing and packing of articles preferably food products. Obviously, no technical knowledge and educational qualification in a science subject as such is essential/required in the case of the applicants. Therefore, the applicants cannot claim equation and parity with the Field Assistants in Prevention of Food Adulteration Unit of Directorate-General of Health Services. The mere fact that the designations of both the classes of employees is similar would not warrant a conclusion that they carry the same degree of responsibilities and discharge duties of the same nature. So, it cannot be said to be a case attracting the rule of 'equal pay for equal work'. Hence, this application is dismissed.

8/1/88
(BIRBAL NATH)
Member

J. D. Jain
(J.D. JAIN)
Vice-Chairman.

8th January, 1988.