

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
KOLKATA BENCH, KOLKATA**

LIBRARY

O.A/350/120/2020

Date of Order: 12.02.2021

Coram: Hon'ble Ms. Bidisha Banerjee, Judicial Member
Hon'ble Dr. Nandita Chatterjee, Administrative Member



Mritunjoy Sahoo
Son of late Gour Hari Sahoo,
Aged about 65 years,
Worked as Ex-Mate of Gang in Engineering Dept.,
Residing at Village Bar Baharpota,
Post Office-Baharpota, PS- Panskura,
District-Purba Medinipur,
Pin 721115, West Bengal.

..... Applicant

Versus

- (i) The Union of India, through General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach Road, Kolkata 700043.
- (ii) The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, South Eastern Railway, Kharagapur, District-Paschim Medinipore, Pin 721301.

..... Respondents

For The Applicant(s): Mr. A.Chakraborty & Ms. P.Mondal, Counsel

For The Respondent(s): Mr. D.Chowdhury, Counsel

ORDER (O.R.A.L)

Bidisha Banerjee, Member (J):

Heard Ld. Counsels for both the parties and perused the record.

2. The applicant has preferred this O.A. to seek the following relief:

"a) An order do issue directing the respondents to fix the pay of the applicant in the Grade Pay of Rs. 2800 with effect from 17.08.2012-22.09.2014 and to grant all consequential benefits including arrears."

3. The grievance of the applicant is that he retired from service w.e.f.

28.02.2014 while working as Gang Mate in Grade Pay Rs. 2000/- whereas as per the Railway Board circular, which provides restructuring of Track Maintainers in all categories in existing Key Man and Gang Mate and redesignated as Track Maintainer Grade-I having Grade Pay Rs. 2800/- w.e.f. 17.08.2012, his pay ought to have been fixed in the Grade Pay of Rs. 2800/-. But, the same was not accorded to the applicant and, as such, he retired while receiving Grade Pay Rs. 2000/-.

4. As hearing, Ld. Counsel for the applicant would submit that the representation of the applicant dated 25.09.2019 (Annexure-A/3) is still pending consideration by the Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, S.E.Railway, Kharagpur (Respondent No.2) and that the grievance of the applicant may be redressed if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to consider his pending representation within a specific time frame.

5. Ld. Counsel for the respondents has no objection for consideration of representation as per rules, if the same is pending.

6. Having heard both the Ld. Counsels, without going into the merits of the case, we dispose of this O.A. by directing respondent No.2 to consider and dispose of the pending representation dated 25.09.2019 (Annexure-A/3) by issuing a reasoned and speaking order, as per rules, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of with no order as to costs.



(Dr. Nandita Chatterjee)
Member (A)



(Bidisha Banerjee)
Member (J)

RK