

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
N E W D E L H I

(3)

O.A. No. 2830 of 1991
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 17.2.1992

<u>Attar Singh</u>	Petitioner
<u>Shri K.L. Bhatia</u>	Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
<u>Union of India</u>	Versus
	Respondent
<u>Shri T.K. Sinha,</u>	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ram Pal Singh, Vice-Chairman (J)

The Hon'ble Mr. I.P. Gupta, Member (A).

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

The applicant was promoted as L.D.C. on 16.9.82. One of the requisite qualification is matic pass or equivalent. The applicant has furnished a certificate given by the Board of Adult Education and Training and on that basis he was appointed as L.D.C. 10 years back. The learned counsel for the respondents contends that the certificate given by the Board of Adult Education and Training is not treated as equivalent to matic. However, we find that 4 applicants who are similarly circumstnced and who had also given certificates issued by the Board of Adult Education and Training were allowed to work as L.D.C. by the order of this Tribunal dated 22.2.91 in O.A. No. 2654/90 etc. Notwithstanding the stand of the learned counsel for the respondents, since the applicant is similarly placed as the applicants in O.A. No. 2654/90 etc., he would be entitled to continue as L.D.C. with all consequential benefits, including arrears of pay and allowances, as admissible. With this direction, the case is disposed of. There is no order as to costs.

I.P. Gupta
 (I.P. GUPTA)

MEMBER (A)

17/2/92

17.2.92
 (RAM PAL SINGH)

VICE-CHAIRMAN (J)