

No.  
Equis  
pay equal  
work

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 92/1990  
T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 7th December 1992.

Shri N.R. Rami and Others Petitioner

Shri D.V. Mahta Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and Others Respondent

Shri Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. R. C. Bhatt Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? ✓
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? ✗
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? ✗
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? ✗

1. Smt. N.R. Rami
2. Shri P.H. Parmar
3. Shri R.B. Gautami
4. Shri D.L. Rangparia
5. Shri K.D. Dangar
6. Kum. C.H. Vasavada
7. Kum. C.A. Chauhan
8. Shri P.J. Oza
9. Shri A.P. Bagdai
10. Shri D.P. Padalia
11. Shri H.N. Mansata
12. Shri H.R. Nanda
- 13.. Shri N.H. Makwana
14. Shri N.T. Kadiwala
15. Shri C.B. Rathod
16. Shri M.D. Vadher
17. Shri C.S. Mori
18. Shri M.M. Charpot
19. Smt. A.H. Mandir
20. Shri N.V. Ashari
21. Shri P.R. Banania
22. Shri J.K. Parmar
23. Shri T.R. Kondhia

All C/o Shri G.D. Ratani

C/o Shri R.S. Vyas,  
2-A Nav Nirman, Agam Nigam Soci.,  
Vatva Road, Isanpur, Ahmedbad.

Applicants.

Advocate Shri D.V. Mehta

Versus

1. Union of India  
Notice to be served through  
Director General of P & T,  
Sanchar Bhavan, Parliament  
Street, New Delhi.
2. Post Master General,  
Gujarat Circle, Ashram Road,  
Ahmedabad.
3. Senior Superin-tendent of RMS  
Rajkot Division, Rajkot.

Respondents.

Advocate Shri Akil Kureshi

ORAL JUDGEMENT

In

O.A.192/1990

Date : 7-12-1992

Per Hon'ble

Shri R.C. Bhatt

Member (J)

1. Twenty Three Applicants have filed <sup>this</sup> ~~these~~ applications under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 seeking the relief that the respondents be directed to pay the difference of remuneration of the applicants in as much as they were paid less than regular employees and the applicants have further prayed that the respondents be directed to give all benefits which were given to the applicants of T.A. 218/1987 by the Judgement dated 17th January 1989, as the present applicants are similarly situated with the applicants of that case.

2. The applicants are working under respondents No.3 Senior Superintendent of R.M.S. Rajkot, as Sorting Assistant. They have produced collectively at Annexure A-1, their appointments ~~orders~~. The learned Advocate for the applicants submitted that in a identical case of Sarvshri A.V. Pathak and others Vs. Union of India and Others <sup>(O.A. 191/90)</sup> decided by this Tribunal on 12th October 1992, ~~the~~ application was partly allowed, <sup>relying on the decision in T.A. 218/87</sup> with the direction that the application in that case filed before the Tribunal be treated as representation as if it is filed before the respondent no.2 of that case and to consider the same on merits. In the light of the decision previously given by this Tribunal in T.A. 218/1987, <sup>we</sup> pass the speaking order.

3. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that in view of the directions given in O.A. 191/90, decided by this Tribunal on 12th October 1992

~~The~~ identical direction may be given in this matter also.

After hearing the learned Advocates, we pass the following order.

ORDER

The application is partly allowed. We direct the second respondent, Post Master General Gujarat Circle, Ahmedabad, to treat the present application filed before us as representation, as if it is filed before the said authority and to consider it on merits, in the light of the decision of this Tribunal in T.A.218/87, and copy of which is produced at Annexure A-2 and then to pass the speaking order after considering the representation of the applicants within two months from the date of receipt of this order. If the applicants feel aggrieved by ultimate order of the second respondents, they are at liberty to approach this Tribunal according to law.

*Order of*  
The applicants should forward the enclosures and copy of this Tribunal to second respondent to enable the said authority to consider the case within the stipulated period.

No order as to cost.

*R.C. Bhatt*

(R.C. Bhatt)  
Member (J)

*N.V. Krishnan*  
7.12.82

(N.V. Krishnan)  
Vice Chairman.

\*AS.



DATE	OFFICE REPORT	ORDERS.
14.5.93		<p data-bbox="455 310 1422 1185">This M.A. 203/93 is filed by the original respondents to extend the time two months to comply with the order passed by this Tribunal in O.A. 192/90 which was decided on 7th December, 1992. This application for extension of time is filed on 22nd March, 1993 which shows that the copy of the M.A. was also served on the learned advocate for the original applicant. No reply is filed to this M.A. We extend the time as prayed for commencing from 22nd March, 1993 meaning thereby that it will expire on 22nd May, 1993 before which date the compliance must be made as per our order in O.A. No further extension will be given. M.A. is disposed of.</p> <div data-bbox="455 1283 870 1406"><p data-bbox="526 1283 802 1325"><i>M.R. Kolhatkar</i></p><p data-bbox="459 1340 734 1406">(M.R. Kolhatkar) Member (A)</p></div> <div data-bbox="1082 1271 1286 1406"><p data-bbox="1127 1271 1256 1315"><i>R.C. Bhatt</i></p><p data-bbox="1090 1340 1286 1406">(R.C. Bhatt) Member (J)</p></div> <p data-bbox="455 1505 530 1530">etc.</p>