

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MADRAS BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION/310/00097/2014

Dated this 20th day of January, Two Thousand Sixteen

P R E S E N T

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RAMANUJAM, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1.K. Devabalan,
S/o A. Kannappan,
No.161, Road Street,
Namathodu Village and Post,
Kolappalur via,
Tiruvannamalai District.

2.N.R. Gopalakrishnan,
S/o K.K. Rajamanickam,
No.1/25, Perumalkoil Street,
Narayananamangalam Village and Post,
Kolappalur via,
Tiruvannamalai District.

3.A.R. Babusrinivasan,
S/o E. Radhakrishnan,
No.15, Veerasamy Street,
Arani, Tiruvannamalai District.

4.A. Namasisvayan,
S/o D. Anbalagan,
No.344, Angalamankoil Street,
Hasanampet,
Tiruvannamalai District.

5.M.Perumal,
S/o A.s. Murugappa Mudaliyar,
No.66/14, Riverbank Street,
Tiruvetipuram(Cheyyar),
Tiruvannamalai District.

6.E. Kumar,
S/o L. Easwaran,
No.29A, Balamurugan Street,
Palampet, Chetpet,
Tiruvannamalai District.

7.A.K. Karthikeyan,
S/o A.S. Krishnamoorthy,
No.88, Brahmin Street,
Alividaithangi Village and Post,
Hasanampet via,
Tiruvannamalai District.

8.M.Mohanarangan,
S/o v. Munusamypillai,
No.275, Vannarapettai Street,
Mathu Village and Post,
Akkur via, Tiruvannamalai District.

9.R. Rajendran,
S/o V. Radhakrishnan,
No.261, Pillayarkoil Street,
Pinnapet Village,
Melmattai Vinnmangalam Post,
Peranamallur via,
Tiruvannamalai District.

10.K. Ramamoorthy,
S/o J. Kannu,
No.664, Mariyammankoil Street,
Kamaraj Nagar,
Paramanthal, Tiruvannamalai District.

11.G. Sheeladevi,
W/o K. Kumar,
No.40/14, Bharathi Street,
Polur Road, Manthoppu,
Tiruvannamalai.

.. Applicants

By Advocate M/s. R. Malaichamy, C. Premkumar, S. Baskar
and K. Vanisree

Vs.

Union of India
rep by the Superintendent of Post Offices,
Tiruvannamalai Division,
Tiruvannamalai.

.. Respondent

By Advocate Shri M. Kishore kumar

ORDER

(Pronounced by The Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Administrative Member)

The applicants' case is that they were appointed as Postman on 9.9.2005 in the respondents' Division. The pay allowed to them was Rs.5680+Grade Pay Rs.2000/- with effect from 1.1.2006. The date of next increment was fixed as 1.7.2006. One Shri T. Gopinath was appointed as Postman on 12.1.2006 in the Chennai City South Division. His initial pay in the Postman cadre was fixed at Rs.6460+G.P.2000/- w.e.f. 1.1.2006 with the date of next increment on 1.7.2006. Following this, a similarly placed person approached this Tribunal for stepping up of his pay on par with Shri T. Gopinath and it was allowed in O.A.No.1239 of 2011 by order dated 28.2.2013. As the applicants herein had also joined in the Department earlier than the said Shri T. Gopinath, they pray for a similar relief of stepping up of pay on par with their junior.

2. The respondents in their reply submit that the representations received from the applicants in this regard have been referred to Postmaster General, Chennai City Region, Chennai, on 23.11.2011. The Postmaster General, Chennai City Division by letter dated 26.3.2012 directed the Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvannamalai Division to examine their eligibility with reference to instructions contained in the DG letters dated 14.9.2010 and 5.1.2011 and resubmit the case with specific recommendations of the Divisional Head in the prescribed format. Accordingly, the case

of the applicants was submitted on 2.5.2012/18.6.2012 in the prescribed format. However, the Service Books of the applicants have been returned citing C.O. Letter No. APA/65-102/11 dated 30.4.2012 and stating that the proposal for stepping up of pay of Postmen officials in respect of Arakkonam and Kanchipuram Division had been taken up with CIFA for concurrence. But CIFA opined that the the above C.O. Letter was not supported by any order/guidelines of the Directorate and suggested that this issue be taken up with the Directorate.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the applicants and the respondents

4. Learned counsel for the applicants referred to orders in O.A.Nos.1511, 1512, 1513 and 1514 of 2011 dated 12.4.2013 in which the relief had been granted to the applicants therein who were similarly placed and the respondents were directed to fix their pay at Rs.6460/- along with a Grade Pay of Rs.2000/- w.e.f. 1.1.2006. He further referred to the orders in O.A.No.1239 of 2011 wherein relief had been granted to another similarly placed person earlier by order dated 28.2.2013. It is submitted that the directions of this Tribunal in these cases have already been complied with and, therefore, there is no justification to deny the stepping up of pay to the applicants herein or to keep the matter pending indefinitely on the excuse of correspondence with the Directorate.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents, however, submits that the representations of the applicants have not been

rejected and the matter is still pending. The respondents could, therefore, be directed to decide the matter within an appropriate time limit.

6. I have carefully considered the matter in the light of the facts of the case and the orders of this Tribunal dated 12.4.2013 in O.A.Nos.1511, 1512, 1513 and 1514 of 2011. In view of the clear direction given by the Tribunal to step up the pay of the applicants therein on par with Shri T. Gopinath at Rs.6460/- with the Grade Pay of Rs.2000/- and the submission that the said orders have been complied with, nothing remains to be further examined by the respondents. It is seen that the Superintendent of Post Offices by Annexure R-3 letter dated 18.6.2012 addressed to the Postmaster General Chennai City Region, Chennai has stated that the case of stepping of pay of the officials listed therein had been examined and they were found eligible. The list includes the names of the applicants. The applicants cannot be made to wait indefinitely for the orders of the competent authority who does not appear to be showing any urgency in the matter. They are entitled to the relief claimed. The respondents are, therefore, directed to step up the pay of the applicants to Rs.6460/- plus Grade Pay of Rs.2000/- w.e.f. 1.1.2006 within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The consequential monetary benefits shall also be paid to them within the said period.

7. The OA is allowed as above. No order as to costs.