

23/12

Central Administrative Tribunal, Circuit Bench,  
Lucknow.

Registration (O.A. No. 195 of 1990)

Geological Survey of India, Drilling  
Officers' Association & another ... Petitioners

Vs.

Union of India & others ... Respondents

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K. Nath, VC,

Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh, AM

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered by Hon'ble Justice K. Nath, VC)

This petition under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeks for a direction to respondents to provide promotion to the Driller Group 'B' and certain other connected reliefs as set out in para 8 of this application.

2. Sri A.K. Chaturvedi has been heard on behalf of the applicant. Sri V.K. Chaudhary has made his presence on behalf of all the respondents.

3. It appears that according to the present scheme, Driller Group 'B' do not have avenues of promotion. Sri A.K. Chaturvedi submits that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of 'Raghu Nath Prasad Singh Vs. Secretary' AIR 1988 SC, page 1033 and in the case of 'CSIR Vs. KGS Bhatt, 1989 (IV), SCC 635 has held that every servant must be provided at least 2 avenues of promotion. The learned counsel further refers to the case of Dr. O.Z. Husain Vs. Union of India & others 1990 SCC, 311 in this connection.


Q

B-2  
✓  
3

4. It is also stated that after the grievance raised by the employee to the respondents, a meeting was held on 19-4-1989 with the Director General, Geological Survey of India, whereupon the Director General had addressed a letter dated 1-5-1989 (Annexure-1) to the Secretary, Department of Mines, Ministry of Steel & Mines, New-Delhi, /respondent no. 1.

5. It is true that <sup>the case</sup> / concerns a policy matter regarding promotion and there are observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court expecting a provision for promotion in the cases referred to above. The learned counsel for the applicant says that no representation in this regard has been brought on record of the case. For a proper decision of the Government on the proposal, there should be a proper representation. We do not think it necessary to keep this case pending any longer because the ends of justice would be met if the applicant makes a proper representation to the competent authority which will be considered by the opposite parties. This petition is disposed of with the direction that if the petitioner<sup>-s</sup> make<sup>or</sup> a representation to the respondent no. 1 through proper channel within a period of six weeks from today, the respondent no. 1 shall dispose of the same by taking a proper decision within a period of six months from the date of petitioner<sup>-s</sup> making the representation.

H. H. Sen.  
(A.M.)

  
(V.C.)

Dated : Lucknow  
September 10, 1990.

ES/