



**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**OA No. 410/2021  
M.A. No. 514/2021**

**This the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021**

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

1. Joint Action Council of Service  
Doctors Organization  
Through its General Secretary  
Dr. Shadab Taj, S/o Dr. Tajul Mulk  
Aged about 42 years, Registered Office  
Flat No. 586, Laxmi Bai Nagar  
New Delhi-110022.
2. Dr. Shadab Taj, S/o Dr. Tajul Mulk  
Aged about 42 years  
Having its office at  
Flat No. 586, Laxmi Bai Nagar  
New Delhi-110022.
3. Dr. Raman Khanna, S/o P.C. Khanna  
Aged about 44 years  
Residing at 21/31 A Tilak Nagar  
New Delhi-110018.

...Applicants

(By Advocate: Sh. Soayib Qureshi)

**VERSUS**

Union of India  
Through Secretary  
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare  
CHS Division  
Nirman Bhavan  
New Delhi 110001.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. Manish Kumar)

**ORDER (Oral)****Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**

The first applicant is the Joint Action Council of Service Doctors Organization. They filed this OA challenging the OM dated 09.04.2019 through which the Doctors in the Central Health Service (CHS) were extended conveyance allowance at a particular rate.

2. The applicants contend that for the past several decades, the conveyance allowance of the Doctors in the CHS were totally different and higher compared to those of other Central Government employees and inadvertently, the 7<sup>th</sup> Central Pay Commission (CPC) applied the same yardstick to the doctors as well as other employees of the Central Government. The impugned order is said to be the result of such a patent mistake. They also raised several grounds.

3. Today we heard Sh. Soayib Qureshi, learned counsel for the applicants and Sh. Manish Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents.

4. The pay structure is a very complex issue. Several factors go into it. Though sometimes it may appear after revision, that particular component has been reduced, it would be adjusted elsewhere. It is only when the entire recommendations are examined as a whole, that the clear picture would emerge. The



impugned order was issued on the basis of the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC. Even according to the applicants, inadvertent mistake has crept into the very recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC. If that is so, the matter needs to be addressed either by the Redressal Committee or by the Government, as and when it is brought to their notice. The applicants did not submit any comprehensive representation to Anomalies Redressal Committee.

5. Therefore, we dispose of the OA leaving it open to the applicants to file a representation before the Anomalies Redressal Committee, if it is in existence, or to the respondents, within four weeks from today. If such a representation is made, the competent authority shall pass orders thereon within a period of three months from the date of receipt of such representation.

Pending MA also stands disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/lg/jyoti/ns/