

—3—

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

OA 2592/92

02.11.1992

Shri Nathilal Bharti ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

CORAM :

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

For the Applicant ... Shri H.P. Chakravorty

For the Respondents ... None

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

The applicant is a Class-IV employee working as Number Marker, Chief Goods Supervisor, Central Railway, Belaganj, Agra and has the grievance that his correct date of birth, according to him, is 5.7.1941, but in the official record, the date of birth is recorded as 2.8.1939. According to the applicant, he entered the service in 1958 much before the circular of 1979 issued by the Railway Board. On finding out this mistake in the recorded date of birth, the applicant is said to have made representations to the respondents in August, 1987 followed by some other representations subsequently. The grievance of the applicant is that his representations have not been disposed of as per the instructions contained in para-2 to 5 of the Indian Railway Establishment Code, Volume I.

The applicant along with his application has also annexed a copy of school leaving certificate in support of his contentions raised in the application regarding his alleged correct date of birth.

It shall be equitable and just if a direction is issued to the respondents to dispose of the representation of the applicant, who is still in service, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The matter, is therefore, not considered on merit and is disposed of at the admission stage itself only with a direction to the respondents as said above.

The respondents are, therefore, directed to consider the representation of the applicant, Shri Nathulal Bharti, son of Shri Lal Bharti working as Number Marker in Central Railway at Belanganj Railway Station and dispose of the same within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and in case any such representation is not available, the applicant may prefer another representation in that regard including a copy of the representation he has already preferred to the respondents. If the applicant is still aggrieved, he can assail the same subject to the law of limitation in the competent forum.

J. P. Sharma
12.11.92
(J.P. SHARMA) 2.11.92
MEMBER (J)
02.11.1992