

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

OA.No.1274/93

Dated this the 11th Day of September, 1995.

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Member(A)
Hon'ble Dr. A.Vedavalli, Member(J)

1. Shri Girja Shanker Misra
aged about 60 years
Senior Drawing Teacher
Govt.Boys Sr.Sec.School,
Moti Bagh-I, New Delhi.
 2. Shri Jagdish Sinha,
aged about 58 years,
Sr.Drawing Teacher,
Govt.Sr.Sec.School,
A.P.Block, Shalimar Bagh,
Delhi 110 052.
 3. Shri B.S. Rawat
aged about 51 years,
P.G.T. Drawing,
Govt. Boys Sr.Sec.School,
Hari Nagar, New Delhi
- ...Applicants

By Advocate: None.

versus

1. The Lt.Governor and Administration
of Delhi, Raj Niwas, Delhi.
 2. The Director Education,
Directorate of Education,
Old Secretariat, Delhi.
- ...Respondents

By Advocate: Shri Amresh Mathur.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige).

In this application, Shri G.S. Mishra and two others have prayed for quashing of the order dated 13.11.92 (Annexure-A), whereby the respondents have promoted persons who were junior to applicants, and ^m for grant of P.G.T. (Drawing) pay scale from the date from which their juniors were promoted as P.G.T.'s ie.

w.e.f. 3.1.74.

2. None appeared for the applicants when this case was called out. Shri Amresh Mathur appeared for the respondents. As this is an old case, we propose to dispose it of, after perusing the documents on record and hearing the learned counsel for the respondents.

3. It appears that the impugned order dated 13.11.92 has been passed in implementation of the Tribunal Judgement dated 23.2.1987 in CW.1312/73 which was transferred from the Delhi High Court to the Tribunal and renumbered as T.75/85.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents ~~has~~ invited our attention to the respondents memorandum dated 25.1.94, a copy of which has been handed over across the bar and which is taken on record. In that memorandum, it has been stated that consequent to the order dated 13.11.92, the respondents had invited claims from other persons who ^{were} ~~are~~ likely to be affected vide their circular dated 25.10.88, in response to which, some persons ~~have~~ filed their claim. It was, therefore brought to the notice of all Drawing Teachers, who were seniors to petitioners in CWP.1312/73 that they should file their claim upto 30.4.94 positively, along with necessary documents to enable the respondents to consider their case afresh. This period was subsequently extended upto 30.5.94. The learned counsel for the respondents has stated at the bar that although the said period has since lapsed and the memorandum itself stated that no claim after that would be entitled, no final decision has so far

1

(12)

been taken in the matter and if the applicants file a representation even at this state, the same would be considered.

5. Noting this assurance by the learned counsel for the respondents at the bar, we dispose of this application with a direction to the applicants that in the event they file ^a ~~an~~ representation within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgement for granting of the benefits given to those covered by the respondents order dated 13.11.92, the respondents will consider the same and dispose of those representations in accordance with law, along ^{the} ~~an~~ with other representations which, according to the learned counsel for the respondents Shri Amresh Mathur, ^{yet} ~~not~~ been disposed of.

6. This OA is disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs.

A. Vedavalli
(Dr. A. Vedavalli)

Member (J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. Adige)

Member (A)

/kam/