

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 132 of 1995

Allahabad this the 06th day of March, 2000

8

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

1. S.P. Sharma S/o Late Harichand Akhtar,
Deputy Superintendent ^{Design} ~~Post~~ Office, Staff
No.00832, Mechanical Design Office, D.L.W.
Varanasi.
2. M.B. 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., Varan-
asi.

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/-

52

3. The General Manager, D.L.W. Varanasi.
4. Babbey Prasad Deputy Superintendent Staff,
No. 00834, Mechanical Design Office, D.L.W.
Varanasi.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Prashant Mathur

ORDER (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. S.K.I. Naq-vi, 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 ⁶ the pay of their junior namely Babbey Prasad in view of F.R. w.e.f. 13.7.1960, the date from which the pay of junior-Babbey 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 Vakalatnama 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~~^{es} not want to prosecute the matter. Shri Amit Sthalekar

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

S. B. Rine
Member (A)

[Signature]
Member (J)

/M.M./