

25

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

RA No. 106/94
in

O.A. No. 2040 of 1990.

New Delhi, this the 7 day of April, 1994.

Hon'ble Mr Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice Chairman.
Hon'ble Mr B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)

Shri Jagdish Singh & Ors
S/O Shri Chandrup Singh,
R/O Village Nirwali,
P.O. Tikri,
NEW DELHI-41.

(petitioners No.1 to 828 as per Annexure 'A' enclosed)

(by advocate Sh. J. P. Verghese). Petitioners

Versus

1. Union of India,
through its Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block,
New Delhi.

2. Secretary
Ministry of Finance,
Dept. of Expenditure,
North Block,
New Delhi.

3. Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel & Training,
North Block,
New Delhi.

4. Chief Security Officer,
Central Secretariat Security Forces,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block, New Delhi. Respondents.

Order (by circulation)

(delivered by Hon'ble Mr B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A))

This review application has been filed in
O.A. No. 2040 of 1990, decided on 18.2.1994. The
applicants, who are working in the Central Secretariat
Security Force are aggrieved that they have not
been treated at par with other similar Forces, like,
the Central Industrial Security Force, Railway
Protection Force and Delhi Police. This Tribunal
had held that their duties cannot be regarded as

comparable to other Armed Forces of the Union, which have been constituted under different acts and on this basis thought it fit not to interfere particularly, in view of the fact that such matters should again be examined by the Vth Pay Commission.

The review application has been filed on the ground that this Tribunal has not taken into account the written submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant at the time of final hearing. However, in the written submissions, the learned counsel has tried to strengthen his case that the training, the nature of duty of S.S.F. are identical to that of cadres in other similar forces. He has again laid a stress on the fact that they have been authorised to keep arms. This Tribunal has considered all these points before coming to the conclusion that their duties cannot be said to be identical to those of the combatant forces and that mere permission to keep arms does not make them "armed forces of the union". These points have already been considered by this Tribunal. We see no merit in the review application and it is hereby dismissed.

B.N.Dhondiyal
(B.N.Dhondiyal)
Member (A)

S.K.Dhaon
(S.K.Dhaon)
Vice Chairman

/sds/