

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH, AHMEDABAD

RA/M.A/O.A./T.A./ 191 198 90

U A Kalaria 2 B Applicant (s).

D v Mehta Adv. for the
Petitioner (s).

Versus

Union of India 2 C Respondent (s).

J D Zimer Adv. for the
Respondent (s).

SR. NO.	DATE.	ORDERS,
		Equal pay Equal work (Copy not-Served)
	2/1/90	Admitted on same stage a 22/1/90 <i>CH</i>
	22/1/90	Advocate/Petitioner absent to-day, nothing filed. Adjudged on same stage on 22/1/90.
	23/1/90	Parties absent no documents filed <i>CH</i> Adjudged on same stage to 23/1/90.
	23/1/90	Adjudged on same stage <i>CH</i> a 24/1/90 <i>CH</i>
	14/06/90	RPAD recd. from Applicant " " " Respo. No. 2
	6-7-90	BA (No one bench is available)
	10/7/90	BA

1. Smt.U.A.Kataria
2. Shri M.N.Patel
3. Shri K.P.Dabhai
4. Smt.M.L.Edi
5. Kum. K.D.Parmar
6. Shri G.D.Ratani
7. Shri A.C.Parmar
8. Shri M.P.Nagori
9. Shri P.D.Patel
10. Shri S.C.Makwana
11. Shri A.R.Parmar
12. Shri V.C.Chaudhari

: Applicants

All C/o.D.V.Mehta
Advocate,
5, Ramannagar Society,
Nr.Swami Narayan Mandir,
Ahmedabad.

Versus

1. Union of India
Notice to be served through
Director General of Posts,
Sanchar Bhavan,
Parliament Street,
New Delhi.
2. Post Master General,
Gujarat Circle, Ashram Road,
Ahmedabad.
3. Senior Superintendent of RMS,
Ahmedabad Division,
(AM) Division, Ahmedabad.

: Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. M.M.Singh

: Administrative Member

Hon'ble Mr. N.R.Chandran

: Judicial Member

ORDER

10/7/1990

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.R.Chandran

: Judicial Member

The applicants are Sorting Assistants recruited under the R.T.P. Scheme. They have filed this application claiming salary on par with regular employees. The learned counsel for the applicants relies upon the decision of this Tribunal in T.A.213 of 1987 wherein this Tribunal had held that there should not be any disparity in pay between the Sorting Assistants

selected under the Reserve Training Pool and a regular employee. Since the case of the applicants herein is identical to that of the applicant in TA 218/1987, the applicants want similar relief in this application.

We find that the decision of this Tribunal in TA 218/1987 was rendered on 17-1-1989 and the applicants did not make any representation to the respondents to apply the ratio of the decision in TA 218/1987 and have directly approached this Tribunal. Therefore, we direct the second respondent to treat this application filed before us as a ^{rep-}presentation filed before that authority and consider it on merits in the light of the decision of this Tribunal in TA 218/1987. The 2nd respondent is further directed to pass a speaking order after consideration of the representation within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. If the order passed by the 2nd respondent on consideration is adverse to the applicants, they are at liberty to approach this Tribunal. The Registry is directed to forward a copy of the

(3) (4)

: - 3 - :

application in OA 191/1980 along with its
enclosures together with a copy of this order
to the 2nd respondent.

Subject to the above observation, the
O.A. is dismissed.

N.R. Chandran
(N.R. CHANDRAN)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

M. M. Singh
(M.M. SINGH)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

10-7-1990

Index: Yes/No