

2
14
Reserved.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD.

Registration No. 218 of 1986.

Vijay Dashmukh Applicant.

V e r s u s

Secretary, Union Public Service Commission
New Delhi and another Opp. parties.

Hon'ble D.S.Misra-Member-A.
Hon'ble G.S.Sharma-Member-J.

(By Hon'ble D.S.Misra)

In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, the applicant has claimed a higher starting salary of Rs.1200/- in the ^{1st} ~~basic~~ pay scale of Rs.1100 -50-1600. According to the application, the applicant had applied for the post of Scientist(C) in response to advertisement published by U.P.S.C. in August, 1984. In column (IX) of the application form, the applicant had specifically mentioned that he had requested for an initial pay of Rs.1,200/- in the pay scale of Rs.1,100-50-1,600. This was with reference to a provision in the advertisement sheet provided along with the application form, in which it was mentioned that higher initial ^{pay} /may be granted to a candidate having special qualification and experience. He was selected for the post, but he was informed by respondent no.2 vide its letter dated 8th August, 1985 that his request for grant of the higher starting salary has not been accepted by U.P.S.C., and therefore, he could not be given the initial salary demanded by him. He had also made a representation to the U.P.S.C. on 23.4.1985, but he had received no reply to his representation. Aggrieved by this, he has filed the instant application.

The applicant has been absenting since filing the application on 26.5.1986. He was informed about the date of hearing of this case but he has failed to appear before us. It appears that the applicant is not interested in pursuing the matter. We have considered the

142/2

(5)

-2-

case even on merits and found that the recommendation of the U.P.S.C. for higher initial salary is not a right having accrued to him under any rule or order on this subject. We also feel that we need not interfere with the judgment of the U.P.S.C. on the vague allegation of the applicant that some other persons having lower qualifications were given higher status.

In our opinion, this application is not maintainable and it is rejected summarily.

JS *blm*
a/100
Member-A

Sharma
9/10/86
Member-J

JS/