

(3)

In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

...

Date of decision: 22.5.1990.

Regn. No. O.A. 600/90

Shri Bhim Singh V.s. UOI & Ors.

Shri S.C. Luthra, counsel with for the applicant
Shri P.L. Mimroth, counsel.

Shri Shyam Moorjani, counsel for the respondents.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri T.S. Oberoi, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

ORDER (oral).

This O.A. has been filed by the Private Secretary to the Chairman of one-man Expert Committee to review the organisational and structural set-up and undertake a study for rationalising and modernising the Locomotive/Rolling Stock Repair Workshops on Indian Railways. The order dated 11.9.1987 (Annexure 'A' to the O.A.) provides for secretarial and other assistance to the Chairman of the Committee. Vide para 8 thereof, it has been stated that the Chairman will be provided a Private Secretary and a Peon. As per the contentions of the applicant in the present O.A., the applicant, Shri Bhim Singh has claimed that he should be paid salary in the pay scale applicable in the case of Private Secretary attached to the Members of the Railway Board. The order dated 11.9.1987, appointing the one-man expert committee, however, does not indicate the pay scale of the Private Secretary.

2. The applicant has made a representation on 12.9.1988 addressed to the Secretary, Ministry of Railways (Annex. A-7 page 16 of the paper book) requesting the

respondents (Railway Board) to grant him the scale of pay as applicable to the Private Secretaries in the Railway Board. It is submitted on behalf of the applicant that no reply has so far been received by him.

3. Since the issue raised in this application is on a small point regarding the grant of pay scale to the Private Secretary to the Chairman of one-man expert committee, depending upon the entitlement and the eligibility of the incumbent, we direct that the respondents should dispose of the above representation within a period of 12 weeks from the date of communication of this order. After the representation is disposed of by the respondents, if the applicant is still aggrieved, he will be at liberty to approach the Tribunal afresh, in accordance with law.

4. This order is without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the respondents.

5. The O.A. is disposed of in terms of the directions given above. There will be no order as to costs.

I. K. Rasgotra
(I.K. Rasgotra)
Member (A) 22/5/90

T. S. Oberoi 22/5/90
(T.S. Oberoi)
Member (J)