

# IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

## NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 521/90  
T.A. No. 199

DATE OF DECISION 15.2.1991.

Shri R.Muthuraman	<del>Petitioner</del> Applicant
Applicant present in person.	<del>Advocate for the Petitioner(s)</del>
Versus	
Chief Secretary, Delhi Admn.	Respondents
Mrs. Ashaka Jain,	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

### CORAM

• The Hon'ble Mr. P.K.KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K.CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? *No*

### JUDGEMENT

( JUDGEMENT OF THE BENCH DELIVERED BY  
HON'BLE MR. D.K.CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER)

The grievance of the applicant, who is working as a Stenographer in the office of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal and Labour Courts, is that the respondents be directed to pay him the difference of overtime allowance due to him in comparison to the amount paid to Shri Ved Prakash Gupta.

2. The applicant has worked in the Raj Niwas Press Office from 25.7.80 to 16.12.86. During that period, he had been asked to work beyond office hours for which overtime allowance is admissible at the then rate of Rs.3.45 per hour. He has alleged that Shri Ved Prakash Gupta, Assistant, was given more overtime allowance than him, though they worked for the same duration.

8

3. The applicant has not produced any document to substantiate the allegation made by him. The respondents have denied having meted out discriminatory treatment to him. As the applicant has not substantiated his allegation, he is not entitled to the relief as prayed for by him. The application is dismissed at the admission stage itself, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

*D.K. Chakravorty* 15/2/91  
( D.K.CHAKRAVORTY )  
MEMBER

*P.K. Kartha* 15/2/91  
( P.K.KARTHA )  
VICE CHAIRMAN