

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH : ALLAHABAD.

Original Application No.909 of 2004.

Allahabad this the 20th day of August 2004.

Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, A.M.

Smt. Chahata Devi alias
Chahita Devi, aged about 25 years
W/o Shri Mukesh Kumar,
R/o House No.248 Mohalla- Abkari,
Muzaffar Nagar.

.....Applicant.

(By Advocate : Sri K.K. Mishra)

1. Union of India
through Secretary
Ministry of Communication,
Department of Posts India
New Delhi.
2. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Muzaffar Nagar.
3. Senior Post Master
Muzaffar Nagar.
4. Smt. Sumitra Devi,
W/o Prem Chand,
R/o O/o G.M. Telecom,
District Muzaffar Nagar.

.....Respondents.

(By Advocate : Sri Saumitra Singh)

O_R_D_E_R

By this O.A. filed under section 19 of Administrative
Tribunals Act 1985, the applicant has prayed for the
following relief(s)

- "(1) That this Hon'ble Court may graciously be
pleased to direct the respondents to mention
the name of applicant in salary voucher in
place of respondent No.4.
- (2) That this Court further be pleased to direct
the respondents not to dispensed with the
service of applicant as part-time Safaiwali
till regular selection is made.
- (3) And this Court further be pleased to pass such
other and/or further order as may be deemed
necessary in the circumstances of the case".

D.R.

2. Shorn of superfluous material, the factual matrix lies in very narrow compass. As per the averment made in the application, the applicant has been working in City Dak Ghar as S-afaiwala since March 4, 2003. It has been alleged that the pay/salary for the month of June, 2004 has not been paid and the voucher has come in the name of Sumitra Devi. She apprehends that the name of Smt. Sumitra Devi appears to have been written by inadvertence. She made a request to the Competent Authority to correct the name by letter dated 30.07.04 (Annexure A-17). She has further represented by her letter dated 03.07.2004 (Annexure A-18).

3. Without going into the merits of the case and without calling for counter, I am of the view that the interest of justice will be better served if a direction is issued to the Competent Authority to consider and decide the representation dated 3.7.2004 (Annexure A-18) by a reasoned and speaking order to be passed and communicated to the applicant within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order. Respondents are also directed to look into her grievance regarding the non-payment of her salary for the month of June, 2004. If she has worked for the period in question, she may be paid as per rules.

4. Accordingly, the O.A. ^{is} disposed of at the admission stage itself in terms of the above direction.

No order as to costs.

Sharma
Member-A.

Manish/-