

(7) (2)  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.Nos.721 & 722 of 2004

Friday, this the 19th day of March, 2004

Hon'ble Shri Justice V. S. Aggarwal, Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri S. K. Naik, Member (A)

OA-721/2004

Shri Satya Pal  
s/o Late Shri Dal Chand  
Trained Graduate Teacher (Eng.)  
Sarvodaya Bal Vidyalaya  
B-Block, Nand Nagri, Delhi-93

OA-722/2004

Shri S.K.Sharma  
s/o Late Shri Beedha Singh  
r/o village & Post Office Razapur  
Distt. Ghaziabad

working at Sarvodaya Bal Vidyalaya  
B-Block, Nand Nagri, Delhi-93

..Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri S.K.Shukla)

Versus

1. Director of Education  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Old Sectt. Delhi-54
2. Dy. Director of Education  
North East District  
Yamuna Vihar  
Delhi-53
3. AAO (District North East)  
District North East  
Yamuna Vihar, Delhi-53
4. Shri Vijendra Pal Sharma  
TGT (Eng)  
through Principal  
Sarvodaya Bal Vidyalaya  
Dilshad Garden  
Delhi-95

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice V. S. Aggarwal:

By this common order, OA-721/2004 filed by Shri  
Satya Pal and OA-722/2004 filed by Shri S.K.Sharma can



conveniently be disposed of together. The basic question involved in both the petitions is identical.

2. For the sake of convenience, we are stating the brief facts from the petition filed by Shri Satya Pal.

3. The applicant joined as an Assistant Teacher in Municipal Corporation of Delhi on 18.7.1980. He was promoted as Trained Graduate Teacher (English) on 29.9.1994 and his basic pay was fixed at Rs.6025/- in the revised pay scale from 1.1.1996. The applicant joined the Delhi Administration on 29.9.1994. The grievance is that respondent No.4 joined the Municipal Corporation of Delhi as Assistant Teacher on 1.1.1982, i.e. after the applicant joined. He was promoted as Trained Graduate Teacher (English) on 13.8.1996 and had also joined the Directorate of Education but he is drawing more salary than the applicant.

4. In this regard, the applicants have submitted the representations to the respondents which are stated to be under consideration.

5. Taking stock of the totality of these facts, when rights of the respondents are not likely to be affected, we deem it unnecessary to issue a show cause notice while disposing of the petition.

6. It is directed that respondent No.1 would consider the representations of both the applicants dated 5.3.2003, 5.6.2003 and 28.1.2004 and pass an appropriate





2

(3)

speaking order preferably within six months of the receipt of a copy of the present order and communicate to the applicants.

7.. Both the OAs are disposed of.

  
( S. K. Naik )  
Member (A)

  
( V. S. Aggarwal )  
Chairman

/sunil/