

Open Court

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 995 of 1996

Allahabad this the 13th day of October, 2000

Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

Satish Chandra Srivastava, a/a 40 years, S/o Sri S.N. Lal Srivastava, R/o 44/2, Manik Chauk Macharhatta, P.O. Sadar, Distt. Jaunpur, now working as Store Keeper/Accountant, Carpet and Weaving Center, Gorahara Distt. Azamgarh.

Applicant

By Advocate Shri R.B. Srivastava

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Textiles, Government of India New Delhi.
2. The Development Commissioner(Handicrafts) Ministry of Textiles, Government of India, West Block-VII, R.K. Puram, New Delhi.
3. The Regional Director(Handicrafts), Office of the Development Commissioner(Handicrafts) Central Region, B-46(j.Park) Mahanagar Extension, Lucknow.
4. Sri V.D. Chaturvedi, Assistant Director, Office of the Development Commissioner, (Handicrafts), D-64/151 A.M-I, Nagar Nigam Colony, Sigra, Varanasi.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Amit Sthalekar

SC - ... pg. 2/-

:: 2 ::

O R D E R (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

The applicant has sought for relief for direction to the respondents to pay the arrears of pay and other allowances w.e.f. December, 1992 to March, 1994 with interest at the rate of 18% per annum. The claim of the applicant is based on the ground that the order dated 12.9.95 passed by the Regional Director, Central Region, Lucknow has not been implemented without any good reason for the same and, therefore, the applicant is entitled for the benefit as they flow from this order. On being denied, he has come up before the Tribunal.

2. Shri Amit Sthalekar, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents have regularised the petitioner's period of absence from the date right from December, 1992 to March, 1994 and treat the same as on leave, and has also been paid arrears of salary amounting to Rs.59,934/- through D.D.dated 08.2.2000 and now no claim remains to be adjudicated. Regarding claim of interest, Shri Amit Sthalekar mentions that the applicant has not mentioned any fact to show that the respondents may be saddled with interest, for unnecessary and on unreasonable ground withholding the payment.

3. For the above, I find that the grievance of the applicant has already been redressed from

:: 3 ::

departmental authorities. No case made out to award interest. The O.A. is dismissed for having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

See & do
Member (J)

/M.M./