

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 132 of 1995

Allahabad this the 06th day of March, 2000

Hon'ble Mr. S. K. I. Naqvi, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. S. P. Biswas, Member (A)

1. S.P. Sharma S/o Late Harichand Akhtar, Deputy Superintendent Design Office, Staff No.00832, Mechanical Design Office, D.L.W. Varanasi.
2. MGB. Johri, S/o Late Sri G.L. Johri, Deputy Superintendent Design Office, Staff No.01915, Mechanical Design Office, D.L.W., Varanasi.
3. J.N. Vallecha, S/o Late Sri G. Ram Vallecha Staff No.02097 Deputy Superintendent Chief Marketing Manager's Office, D.L.W. Varanasi.
4. S.N. Bhattacharya S/o Late Sri A.N. Bhattacharya Deputy Superintendent Design Office, Staff No. 00828, Mechanical Design Office, D.L.W., Varanasi.

Applicants

BY Advocate Shri Rakesh Verma

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Railway C/o General Manager, D.L.W. Varanasi.
2. The Railway Board through its Secretary, C/o General Manager, D.L.W. Varanasi.

..... pg. 2/-

{}

3. The General Manager, B.L.W. Varanasi.

4. Babbe Prasad Deputy Superintendent Staff,
No. 00834, Mechanical Design Office, B.L.W.
Varanasi.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Prashant Mathur

ORDER (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. S.K.I. Naqvi, Member(J)

The applicants 4 in number have come up for a direction to the respondents to fix the pay of the applicants at par ~~with~~ ^{to} the pay of their junior namely Babbe Prasad in view of F.R. w.e.f. 13.7.1966, the date from which the pay of junior-Babbe Prasad has been fixed, and with all consequential benefits including the arrears of pay and also to quash the orders, copy of which have been annexed as annexure A-1, A-1A dated 06.12.1994 through which the applicants were denied the benefit of fixation.

2. The respondents have contested the case and filed the pleadings.

3. At the stage of final hearing, Shri Rakesh Verma, Advocate has filed his Vaklatnama on behalf of the applicant with the mention that the relief sought for in this O.A. ~~has~~ already been provided to them by the respondents and, therefore, they ~~do~~ not want to prosecute the matter. Shri Amit Sthalekar

:: 3 ::

learned counsel for the respondents has no objection to this prayer to get the U.A. dismissed. Accordingly, the U.A. is dismissed as not pressed. No order as to costs.

S. Rice

Member (A)

S. C. K.

Member (J)

/M. M.