

10-8-05  
OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH

\* \* \*

Allahabad : Dated this 30th day of August, 2001.

Original Application No. 998 of 2001.

CORAM :-

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr. Rafiquddin, J.M.

Anand Prakash Singh, S/o Late Rajendra Bahadur Singh, R/o 23/47/125/K(1205) Allapur, Allahabad.

(Sri N.P. Singh, Advocate)

. . . . . Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India

Through the Secretary Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions, Department of Personnel and Training, Sardar Patel Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.

2. Commandant,

Ordnance Depot, Fort,  
Allahabad.

3. Controller of Defence Accounts

Office of CDA, Central Command,  
Lucknow.

(Sri Gyan Prakash, Advocate)

. . . . . Respondents

O R D E R (O\_r\_a\_l)

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

This application has been filed for a direction to the respondents to pay the increments from 1-7-1989 to 31-12-1991 on his ad hoc promotion and for a direction to the respondents to expeditiously obtain ex post facto approval on ad hoc promotion of the applicant and fix the applicant's pay on promotion for the purposes of increments counting his previous service rendered on the post of <sup>l</sup> 006(S) and make the payment of difference

of salary alongwith 24% interest. A prayer has also been made to pay arrears of increments due in the substantive post in the scale of Rs.2000-32000 on his regular promotion w.e.f. 4-3-1998.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the applicant on the point of admission and also Sri Gyan Prakash, learned Additional Standing Counsel, appearing for the respondents.

3. We find from the facts as narrated by the applicant that the ad hoc officiation from 1-7-1989 to 31-12-1991 was not approved by the respondents. There is no order of non-approval. There is no order of ad hoc officiation. Learned counsel for the applicant also states that the applicant was not paid the scale of Rs.2000-32000 during the so called period of ad hoc officiation. In the circumstances we find no reasons as to why the OA should be admitted.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant prays that the respondents be asked to decide his representation dated 30-8-2000. Since the applicant is not able to establish his ad hoc officiation in the scale of Rs.2000-3200 from 1-7-1989 to 31-12-1991, we do not consider it proper to issue any direction to the respondents to decide his representation. The OA is dismissed as lacking in merits. No costs.

*Retired*  
Member (J) Member (A)

Dube/