

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/01167/2019**

**DATED THIS THE 09<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2021**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE SHRI SURESH KUMAR MONGA, MEMBER (J)**

**HON'BLE SHRI RAKESH KUMAR GUPTA, MEMBER (A)**

R. Nagendra (MES 604525),  
S/o Madaiah,  
Aged about 46 years,  
Working as Safaiwala,  
O/o Garrison Engineer (Project),  
No. 1, Ulsoor Road,  
Shivanshetty Garden Post,  
Bangalore 42

....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri M. Subramanya Bhat)

Vs.

1. Union of India  
Through its Secretary  
Ministry of Defence,  
Central Secretariat,  
New Delhi 110 001

2. Engineer in Chief,  
Engineer in Chief's Branch,  
Army Head Quarters, DHQ (PO), New Delhi 01

3. The Chief Engineer,  
Head Quarters, Southern Command,  
Engineer's Branch, Pune-01

4. Commander Works Engineer (Army),  
No. 101 Dickenson Road,  
Shivanshetty Garden Post,  
Ulsoor Road, Bangalore 42

5. Head Quarters Chief Engineer,  
Chennai Zone, 1<sup>st</sup> Island Ground, Chennai – 09

6. Additional Director General (Projects),  
C/o HQ Cost Guard Region (Estt),  
Near Napier Bridge, Chennai 600009

.....Respondents

(By Shri Sugumaran, ACGSC)

**ORDER (ORAL)****PER: SURESH KUMAR MONGA, MEMBER (J)**

The present Original Application has been filed by the applicant under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking therein a direction to respondents to extend the benefit of the order dated 08.02.2011 by granting the revised pay in PB-1 with Grade Pay of Rs. 1800/- w.e.f. 01.01.2006 and re-designate him as Mate (Painter) and also to grant him all the consequential benefits including the benefit of notional promotion to the semiskilled, skilled, Highly Skilled-I and Highly Skilled-II posts after determining his eligibility in terms of the Recruitment Rules.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the matter is squarely covered by a judgment rendered by the Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal in OA No. 109/2012 K. Vijayan and others vs The Chief Engineer (Naval Works) and others decided on 12.12.2012.

3. Learned counsel further submitted that in order to claim parity with his counterparts in the State of Kerala and while placing reliance upon the judgment in K. Vijayan (*supra*), the applicant had submitted a representation dated 10.07.2019 on which no decision has been taken by the respondents upto now. Learned counsel further submitted that the applicant will be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to decide his pending representation within a timeframe.

4. Keeping in view the aforesated limited prayer made by learned counsel for the applicant, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the present Original Application without entering into the merits of the case.

5. Accordingly, the Original Application is disposed of with a direction to Commander Works Engineer (Army), Bangalore (Respondent No. 4) to decide the applicant's pending representation dated 10.07.2019 and pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law. Before taking such a decision, the applicant shall also be afforded an opportunity of hearing. The whole exercise shall be undertaken within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. There shall be no orders so as to costs.

**(RAKESH KUMAR GUPTA)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(SURESH KUMAR MONGA)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

/ksk/