

A3  
1

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH

Original Application No. 575 of 1992

H.S. Sharma - - - . . . . . Applicant

Versus

Union of India through G.M., Northern Railway,  
New Delhi.

2. The Chief Track Engineer, N.Rly. Baroda House,  
New Delhi.

3. The Divisional Railway Manager, Northern  
Railway, Allahabad.

4. The Senior Divisional Engineer, No.3, Northern  
Railway, Allahabad.

5. The senior Divisional Personnel Officer  
N.Rly., Allahabad.

Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Prasad, J.M.

The applicant has approached this tribunal under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 with the prayer to the effect that the respondents be directed to decide the entitlement of the applicant for the intervening period from 25.1.1985 to 14.12.87 i.e. from the date of removal to re-instatement according to the statutory rules on the subject and he be given all the consequential benefits.

2. The applicant was working as P.W.I. Etawah and he was removed from service on 25.1.1985 by Senior Divisional Engineer, Northern Railway Allahabad and his appeal was rejected by D.R.M., Allahabad on 27.7.85, as a result the applicant ~~was~~ moved the representations to the authorities concerned. The applicant was re-instated in service on 14.12.1987. The applicant resumed his duty on re-instatement after passing requisite medical examination on 15.12.1987. The main grievance of the applicant appears to be that despite his <sup>representations</sup> ~~statement~~ no specific order regarding his

enti

Contd..2/-

(A3/2) (3)

:: 2 ::

*above,* entitlement for the wages during the period as specified has still not been made despite representation dated 13.4.1988 (annexure *4*) and *subsequent* ~~substantial~~ reminder dated 19.3.1991 (annexure-A5); and the above representations *are* ~~is~~ still lying undecided and pending with the respondents No.2.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and perused the application and papers annexed thereto.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant while drawing my attention to the contents of the application and annexure *annexed* thereto has urged that the main grievance of the applicant would be redressed if the above representations of the applicant is decided by the respondent No.2 by a reasoned and speaking order within a suitable period. Thus, this being so, I find it expedient that ends of justice would be met if the respondents No. 2 is directed to decide the above representations of the applicant dated 13.4.88 and *subsequent* ~~otherwise substantial~~ reminder dated 19.3.1991 (annexure *A4 and A5*) respectively by ~~a~~ reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, within ~~the~~ period of 2 months from the date of ~~a~~ receipt of ~~a~~ copy of this order; and I order accordingly.

5. The application of the applicant is disposed of as above at admission stage. No order as to the costs.

  
Member (J)

1.5.1992

Allahabad dated ~~30.4.92~~ 1st May, 1992.

(RKA)