

(3)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 2081/1990

New Delhi, This the 26th Day of October 1994

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur, Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvenadham, Member(•)

1. Shri Siri Ram son of Sh.Ram Lal resident of 1/91/5, West Rohtash Nagar Gali No.4, near Punjab Hotel, Shahdara Delhi 110032.
2. Shri R.K.Jain son of Shri M.S.Jain r/o Prabhu Bhawan, near City Arya Samaj Mandir, Sonipat-131001.
3. Shri R.C.Sharma son of late Shri Shanti Swaroop 1738, Nai Basti S.P.Mukerjee Marg, Delhi-110006.
4. Shri K.S.Verma son of Shri Gian Dass WZ-498, Naraina, New Delhi 110028.
5. Shri Tilak Raj son of late Shri Harnam Dass 4612, Arya Pura, Delhi
6. Mrs.B Tigga w/o Shri T.S.Alibrt WZ-20, Possangipur Village Janakpuri, New Delhi.

..Applicants

Versus

1. Delhi Administration Through Chief Secretary 5, Alipur Road, Delhi.
2. The Secretary (Labour) Delhi Administration 15, Rajpur Road, Delhi.

..Respondents

By None

ORDER(Oral)

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur, Chairman

1. The applicants seek a direction to the respondents to pay them salary in the same scale of ~~as~~ ^{pay is} being paid to their counter-parts working in Civil and Criminal Courts under the Delhi Administration.

2. The applicants are working on the post of Readers in the Labour Courts and Industrial Tribunals under Delhi Administration. Their scale of pay is Rs.1200-2040. The applicants assert that Readers in Civil and Criminal Courts under Delhi Administration gets salary in the scale of pay Rs.1640-2900. According to the applicants they and the readers in the Civil and Criminal Courts are discharging duties of identical nature and therefore there is no reason to deny them the scale which has been allowed to readers of the Civil and Criminal Courts.

3. The application has been opposed on behalf of the respondents. A reply has been filed in which the applicants' claim of parity has been denied. In para 4.7 it is asserted that the duties performed by the applicants are of routine ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~sterio-type~~ nature.

4. In order to claim parity it was necessary for the applicants to point out the sources of recruitment, the qualification prescribed, the method of recruitment and the quantum of work discharged by the readers in the two courts. There is no statement regarding the nature of recruitment, qualification prescribed and sources of recruitment. The claim of parity is therefore unsustainable.

5. Though the applicants claim that they have been discharging duties of identical nature they have not placed on record the cause lists of Labour Courts and Tribunals or of the Civil and Criminal Courts. Even the number of cases

listed before the Labour Courts and Tribunals on a day has not been indicated. It may be said that the nature of work is identical but if the volume of work is different, the claim for parity would be mis-conceived.

6. In view of the above, the application lacks merit and is hereby dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

J. J. 2-2

(P.T.Thiruvenagadam)
Member(A)
27.10.94

(S.C.Mathur)
Chairman
27.10.94

LCP