

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

OA No. 837/2020

New Delhi this the 26th day of June, 2020

**Hon'ble Sh. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)
Hon'ble Sh. R. N. Singh, Member (J)**

1. Brajesh Tiwari, Aged about 53 years,
Group-B, Nursing Officer,
Central Jail Hospital, Tihar,
New Delhi-110064
2. Suman Khandelwal, Aged about 43 years
Group-B, Nursing Officer,
Central Jail Hospital, Tihar,
New Delhi-110064
3. Ram Avtar Yadav, Aged about 42 years,
Group-B, Nursing Officer,
Central Jail Hospital, Tihar,
New Delhi-110064
4. Sultan Yadav, Aged about 47 years,
Group-B, Nursing Officer,
Central Jail Hospital Tihar,
New Delhi-110064

(By Advocate: Mr Ram Niwas Buri)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
(Nursing Section), Through Principal Secretary,
IP Estate, Delhi Secretariat,
New Delhi-110002
E-mail: pshealth@nic.in
2. Resident Medical Officer,
Central Jail Hospital, Tihar,
New Delhi-110064
E-mail: rmo-ihar@gov.in

(By Advocate: Ms Esha Mazumdar)

O R D E R (O R A L)

By Hon'ble Sh. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A):-

This is a case of four Nursing Officers working under GNCTD. There are four applicants. They were granted certain pay fixation with effect from 01.1.2006 as per 6th CPC notification. Subsequently, these pay fixations were revised upwards on 21.03.2020, 18.04.2020, 22.04.2020 and 22.04.2020 respectively for the four applicants on the plea that para 7(i and ii) of 6th CPC notification were not followed earlier.

2. These revised pay fixations have now been reverted to the earlier levels vide orders dt 19.6.2020, on the plea that upward revision was not warranted in the first place. It is specifically mentioned in this letter Dt 19.6.2020 that para 7 (i and ii) of 6th CPC notification was already followed earlier while granting pay fixation. The applicants are aggrieved at this order of 19.06.2020.

3. On being queried, learned counsel for applicant, mentioned that they had not made any representation so far to the administration in respect of their grievance raised in this OA.

4. At this stage, after arguing at length, learned counsel for applicant seeks permission to withdraw the

OA, with liberty to the applicant to make a comprehensive representation(s) to the competent authority for redressal of their grievances in the matter.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the permission is granted.

6. OA is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the applicant to make a comprehensive representation(s) to the competent authority within a period of 10 days from today and on receipt of such representation(s), respondents are directed to consider the same and pass a speaking and reasoned order as expeditiously as possible and in any case within six weeks of receipt of such representation(s).

7. OA is disposed of in view of the aforesaid permission. No order as to costs.

(R. N. Singh)
Member (J)

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)

sunita/neetu