## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL (ALLAHADAD BENCH) ALLAHADAD.

THAND. 98 1882 of 1982 OF 199	late of decision: 3 12 92
Projectal Sets & Ragherana	Petitioner
shi P.K. Kashiyap Versus Uman Gandindors	•
SRI A.K. Gans	
老法法 <del>法教授</del> 法法法教者	
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice  The Hon'ble Mr. K. Olyg	go, mension (A)
1. Whether Reporters of local papers the judgment ?	
2. To be referred to the Reporter or	not ? I
3. Whether their Lordships wish to se	ee the fair copy of the judgment ? 🦿
4. Whether to be circulated to all of	cher Benches ?

Signature

NAGVI/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TIREBUNAL

ALLAHABAD BENCH

Misc. Application No. 1532 of 1992 In Original Application No. 319 of 1992

Pyere Lal Seth and Raghavendra

Prasad

..... Applicants

Versus

Union of India and Others

.... Respondents

CUPMM:

Hon. Mr. Justice U.C. privastava, V.C Hon. Mr. K. Obayya, Member(A)

13/1/93

:: 2 ::

The applicants are working as Head Clerks 2. in the Office of the Deputy Chief Commercial Supdt. Korthern Railway, Varanasi. The applicant no.1 was appointed as Junior Clerk on 1.8.73 through Railway Service Commission and was posted in the Railway dlectrification, at Allahabad. The applicant no.2 was appointed as Junior clerk on 10.9.73 through the mailway/Commission and was posted in the Railway electrification Allahabad. The lien of the applicants were fixed in the office of the Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, Charbagh, Lucknow viae G M, Northern mailway's letter dated 26.7.75. This lien of the applicant was changed from the office of Daputy Chief Mechanical Engineer to the of Deputy Chief Commercial Supdt, Varanasi through notification dated Jan. 1977.

his lien was originally fixed in the affice of the Deputy Chief Controller of Stores, Alambagh,
Lucknow vide letter dated 26.7.75 and was changed to Varanasi on 16.4.77. The applicant no.1 was released from Mailway Electrification office to join his duty at Deputy Chief Commercial Supdt's office Varanasi vide order dated 21.6.77 and the applicant no.2 was also directed to report the duty at Varanasi like him. They were promoted as

:: 3 ::

(Enew)

and the applicant no.2 was promoted w.e.f. 10.1.34 and their pay was fixed at 25/- from 1.1.84 and an yearly increment at the rate of 25.15/- per month that after coming into force the IVth Pay Commission it was fixed to 25.1440/- from 1.1.86. It is there after the applicants seniority was fixed in the year 1978 and 1979 and according to the applicants their seniority was wrongly fixed and inas much as their juniors were placed above them who were appointed as Senior Clerks and Head Clerks after the appointment of the applicants.

- the seniority and as a result of this change in the seniority was that the basic pay of the applicants in the cadre of Senior Clarks and Head Clark was also reduced. Failing to get any relief from the department, the applicants ultimately have approached this Tribunal contending that the respondents have wrongly and arbitrarily reduced the pay of the applicants vide office order dated 14.2.92 and the seniority list has wrongly prepared.
- of the applicant and they have pointed out that the applicants have not come to Varanasi to the Deputy Chief Commercial supdis office on their own request in administrative exigency they were

:: 4 ;:

transferred. As they were transferred in exigency their lien has been treated as 'transferred ton request and they have been assigned their seniority from the date of their transfer of lien in the office of Deputy Chief Commercial Supdt. Varenesi. Even if it would be said that the lien has been transferred, to the office of Chief Commercial Suport. Varanasi, it could not be treated to be a case of transfer on request. The respondents themselves have stated in clear and categorical language that no request was made as such and they have not come to Varanasi If at therir own request. /They have not come to Varanosi on their own request, their lien even if is transferred, their services cannot be taken away when a fresh seniority list was propared, they were to be given benefit of their old service as their lien of services always subsisted instead from Lucknow to Allahabad they are transferred to Varanasi. The seniority list in these circumstances were wrongly prepared and taking to be a case of voluntary transfer.

Accordingly, the senioirty list as it is today deserves to be quashed. So far as the applicants are concerned, the respondents are directed to refix the seniority list after taking into consideration the version of the affected persons in accordance with law in the light of observations made above within a period of three

months. The applicants may also be given benefits of salary which they are entitled to have. Their salary cannot be reduced for stepping up the salary of the /admitted juniors and let the restoration also be done within this period.

7. With the observations, the application stands disposed off finally. No order as to the costs. All the misc. applications at here also stand disposed off with the above observations.

Markeys (A)

VICE CHAIRMAN

Dated: 3rd December, 1992

(UV)