

AB
②

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH.

.....

Registration No. O.A. 621 of 1992.

Km. Vanmala VadhwaApplicant.
Versus

Union of India and othersRespondents.

(By Hon. Mr. S.N. Prasad, Member(J))

The applicant has approached this Tribunal under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals, Act 1985 mainly with the prayer for quashing the impugned order dated 31.3.1992 passed by the Joint Director on behalf of adjutant general (Annexure-B), and for quashing the impugned order ^{dt. 21.11.1990} closing the subject in respect of the appointment on the post of Steno Grade-II and for other consequential reliefs;


2. The main grievance of the applicant as ventilated in her application is to the effect that though all formalities right from the sending of the application till the last stage of the issue of appointment letter were in regard to the appointment of applicant as Seno Grade-II but strangely enough ^{manoeuvring} ~~maneuvering~~ culminated into the issue of the appointment letter in favour of the applicant for the post of Steno Grade-III as would be obvious from the perusal of Annexures 7 to 9 as alleged by the applicant. It has further been stated that instead of rectifying the irregularities committed on the part of the respondents and with a view to plug the loop holes of the process of selection, the impugned order dated 31.3.1992 (Annexure-B) has been passed.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and have gone through the records of the case. The learned counsel for the applicant while adverting the contents of

A3
3

the application and the papers annexed thereto has urged that the representation of the applicant dated 7.4.1992 (Annexure- A 13) which has been forwarded by the ~~concerned~~ officer concerned to the Chief/Army Staff (respondent no.1) through proper channel has still not been decided and the same is still pending with the respondent no. 1 and a decision of the above representation by the respondent no.1 will go along way in giving substantial relief to the applicant and has urged that suitable direction be issued in this regard to the respondents. A perusal of the application of the applicant read together with the Annexures annexed thereto, particularly Annexures 7 to 9 lend much support to the version of the applicant. Having considered all the facts and circumstances of the matter, I find it expedient in the interest of justice that the respondent no.1 be directed to decide the above representation dated 7.4.1992 (Annexure-A 13) by a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with the extant rules, regulations and orders in this regard and till the decision of the above representation dated 7.4.1992, the operation of the impugned order dated 31.3.1992 (Annexure-B) shall remain stayed provided the applicant has not been relieved so far; I order accordingly.

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


Member (J) 30.4.92

Dated: 30.4.1992
(n.u.)