

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

Page No. 1

OA/EX/RA/CCP No. 625/90 19

K.P. Bhattacharya Shri B.B. Srivastava
APPLICANT(S) COUNSEL

U.O.I. VERSUS

RESPONDENT(S) COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p><u>10.4.90</u> OA 625/90</p> <p>Applicant through Shri R.N. Gupta, proxy counsel for Shri B.B. Srivastava, counsel.</p> <p>At the request of Shri R.N. Gupta, the case is adjourned to 17.4.1990.</p> <p><i>Abhay</i> @ (I.K. Rasgotra)/90 (Amitav Banerji) SRD Member (A) Chairman</p>
		<p><u>17.4.1990</u> OA-625/90</p> <p>B. B. Srivastava</p> <p>Present: Shri K.P. Bhattacharya, Counsel for applicant.</p> <p>Heard the Ld. Counsel for the applicant. This is a case where the applicant has been working as a Peon on the non-technical side. In his channel he has been considered for promotion and he is presently working as Daftry. Further promotions in his own line will be available within the prescribed quota as LDC. The applicant in the present application is comparing and seeking promotion with those who are on the technical side. The comparison between the seniority of those who have worked all through on the technical side with non-technical person is not relevant. The basis for filing the application presently is the representation made on 5.1.1990 to the Minister for Science and Technology. The</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Contd....</p>

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p><u>From pre-page</u></p> <p>Minister for Science and Technology has explained the position in his answer at Annexure-I to Shri Samar Mukherjee, Member of Parliament who had sponsored his case. Repeated representations cannot be considered as supporting point for the purpose of promotion. Having regard to the above we are not inclined to issue notice, as prayed for by the Lt. Counsel for the applicant, or to consider admission of the case. Dismissed at the admission stage.</p> <p><i>sh. Ray</i> (I.K. Rasgotra) Member (A) 7/4/90</p> <p><i>Ab</i> (Amitav Banerji) Chairman</p>