

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

REGN.NO. O.A. 222/87.

DATE OF DECISION: 19th August, 92.

M.K. Sekhri.

..... Petitioner.

Versus

U.O.I. & Anr.

..... Respondents.

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.  
THE HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOPI, MEMBER(A).

For the Petitioner.

.... Shri B. Krishnan,  
Counsel.

For the Respondents.

.... Shri N.S. Mehta,  
Sr. Standing Counsel

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Malimath,  
Chairman)

The complaint in this case is that whereas the petitioner and Shri K. Manian were both appointed on probation as Pay and Accounts Officers (Group 'B') to the Junior Time Scale by the same order dated 15.4.1982, the petitioner has been confirmed w.e.f. 17.11.1983 while Shri K. Manian has been confirmed w.e.f. 15.4.1982 by the impugned order dated 10.9.1984. It looks rather surprising that Shri K. Manian has been given an earlier date of confirmation than the petitioner. But we need not examine the grievance of the petitioner any further for the reason that Shri K. Manian retired on 30.6.1982 i.e. within 15 days after his appointment and no other officer junior to the petitioner was confirmed from a date earlier than the petitioner. Hence, even assuming that granting of confirmation to Shri K. Manian w.e.f. 15.4.1982 is not legal and proper, it does not in any way affect the interest of the petitioner. It is academic to examine the validity of confirmation of Shri K. Manian with effect from an earlier date than the petitioner. The petition fails and is, therefore, dismissed.

*I.K. Rasgo*  
( I.K. RASGOPI )  
MEMBER(A)

*V.S. Malimath*  
( V.S. MALIMATH )  
CHAIRMAN