

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH : ALLAHABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 657/2002

TUESDAY, THIS THE 4TH DAY OF JUNE, 2002

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.R.K. TRIVEDI .. VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. C.S. CHADHA .. MEMBER (A)

Birendra Prasad,
S/o Late Lalta Prasad,
R/o 31/38, Stanley Road,
Allahabad.

...

Applicant

(By Advocate Shri A.C. Mishra)

versus

1. Union of India, through
Defence Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.

2. Departmental Promotion Committee,
through its Chairman, Chairman,
U.P.S.C., New Delhi.

3. Engineer-in-Chief,
Army Head Quarters,
D.H.Q. P.O.,
New Delhi - 110 011.

...

Respondents

(By Advocate Shri R.K. Tiwari)

ORDER - (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.R.K. Trivedi, Vice Chairman:

By this application under Section 19 of the A.T. Act, the applicant has prayed to quash the panel dated 14.3.2002 (Annexure-I) and for a direction to the respondents to declare fresh panel including the name of the applicant for promotion to the post of Senior Barrack Store Officer.

2. The facts of the case are that the applicant joined respondents as Supervisor, Barrack Store Gr.II. He passed the prescribed departmental examination of Store Keeper and was confirmed as Supervisor, Barrack Stores Gr.III, in the year 1969. The applicant was subsequently promoted as Supervisor, Barrack Stores Gr.I in 1972. Then,


he was



he was promoted as Barrack Store Officer in 1983. The next promotion to the applicant was to Senior Barrack Store Officer. It ~~had~~^{has} been stated that, however, the applicant has been ignored and by the impugned panel many persons junior to him ~~have~~^{had} been promoted as Senior Barrack Officers.

3. Before coming to this Tribunal, the applicant filed a representation before Respondent No.3, Engineer-in-Chief, Army Head Quarters, New Delhi. A copy of the representation dated 19.3.02, is at Annexure-III. The counsel for the applicant has submitted that the representation has not yet been decided. As the applicant has already approached the competent authority, ~~we may grant the relief to the applicant.~~ In our opinion, ends of justice will be served if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation by a reasoned order within a specified time.

4. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of with a direction to Respondent No.3, Engineer-in-Chief, to consider and decide the representation of the applicant dated 19.03.02, by a reasoned order within a period of 2 months. To avoid delay, it shall be open to the applicant to annexe a copy of the representation along with a copy of the order. No order as to costs.


MEMBER (A)


VICE CHAIRMAN