

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH**

OA 310/01516/2015

Dated Friday the 30th day of October Two Thousand Fifteen

P R E S E N T

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SESHASAYANA REDDY, Member (J)
&
HON'BLE DR. P. PRABAKARAN, Member(A)

M. Irudayasamy,
No.543/J Pudukuppam,
Ulundurpet Main Road,
Vridhachalm- 606 601.

... Applicant

By Advocate: **M/s. Ratio Legis**

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by
The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Chennai- 600 003;
2. The Divisional Railway Manager
Tiruchchirapalli Division,
Southern Railway,
Trichy.

... Respondents

By Advocate : **Sri P. Srinivasan**

ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Seshasayana Reddy, Member(J))

This Original Application is filed by M. Irudayasamy Under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals' Act seeking direction to consider the representation dated 19.09.2014 for grant of compulsory retirement pension.

2. The applicant joined as a Casual Labourer in the year 1980 and subsequently conferred with temporary status on 13.07.1981. He was absorbed as Sweeper cum Porter (SCP) in the year 1987. Departmental Proceedings came to be initiated against him on the ground that he accepted Rs.6650/- to secure a job and handed over forged letter of appointment to one Shri Samikannu. The Disciplinary Authority imposed punishment of reduction of pay. The appellate authority enhanced the punishment to removal from service with effect from 13.07.1993. The applicant submitted revision petition before the General Manager - 1st respondent. The Revisional Authority modified the punishment of removal to compulsory retirement. The applicant submitted a representation dated 19.09.2014 for grant of compulsory retirement pension. There being no action on the part of the respondents, he approached this Tribunal invoking the jurisdiction under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals' Act seeking the relief stated supra.

3. When the matter came up for admission, P. Srinivasan, Learned Senior Standing Counsel for Southern Railway and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4. Heard Learned Counsel on both sides.

5. The limited grievance of the applicant is non-consideration of his representation dated 19.09.2014. In that view of the matter, we deem it appropriate to direct the 2nd respondent to consider the representation of the applicant submitted on 19.09.2014 and pass appropriate orders within a period of eight

3 of 3

weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Accordingly, the O.A. is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.
