

B
IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 318 of 1992
T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 7th October 1992

Shri H.L. Trivedi Petitioner

Party in Person Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and Ors Respondent

Shri Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. Shri 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? ✕

Shri H.L. Trivedi
Behind Pragati Bank
Nizampura, Vadodara 390 002

Applicant.

Party in person.

Versus

1. Union of India
Through Secretary
Ministry of Forests & Environment
Paryavaran Bhavan
New Delhi
2. The Government of Gujarat
Through Secretary
Department of Forests & Environment
Gandhinagar
3. The Principal, Chief Conservator of Forests
Gujarat State
Vadodara
4. The Pay and Accounts Officer
Old Sachivalaya
Gandhinagar

Respondents.

Advocate Shri Akil Kureshi

ORAL JUDGEMENT
In

O.A. 318 of 1992

Date : 7-10-1992.

Per Hon'ble Shri N. V. Krishnan Vice Chairman.

Shri H.L. Trivedi applicant in person.

Shri Akil Kureshi advocate for the respondents.

Shri Akil Kureshi enters appearance for the respondents (1)
and submits that the applicants grievance is essentially against the

State Government and other officers ie. Respondents 2 ^{to} and 4.

2. Respondent no. 4 is represented by Shri P.M. Shah. None for the respondent 2 and 3, though served.

3. The 4th respondent has filed a reply dated 6.10-92 as also copy of a letter dated 25-9-1992 written by his office informing the applicant that he is entitled to Rs. 4000/- per mensem from 30-10-1986 in the Senior time Scale Rs. 3000/-Rs. 4500/- from time to time till the date of his voluntary retirement on 30-1-1987. The letter has also been endorsed to the second respondent as also ^{to} third respondent requesting them to send the revised last Pay certificate of the applicant, to enable the 4th respondent to prepare pension papers etc.

4. A copy of the 4th Respondents reply and the above letter has also been served on the applicant. The applicant submits that in view of this order, the prayer made by him had been substantiated by the department. He however, prays that in view of the undue delay in passing this order, he should be given the interest and the cost of this application.

5. We have heard the parties. We notice that the grievance of the applicant had arisen on 21-9-1988 in respect of the Annexure A-1 letter. He filed representations and finally approached this Tribunal only in February 1992. He has also filed M.A. 339/92 for condonation of delay.

6. In the light of these circumstances and in the view that we are taking of this matter, we condone the delay and admit the application and proceed to dispose it of finally without waiting for any further reply from respondent 2 and 3. We dispose of this application with directions to the second and the third respondents, to furnish the information required by the 4th respondent ~~to~~

within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order and we direct the 4th respondent to prepare the pension papers and send it to the competent authority within a period of one month thereafter .

7. In view of our findings that applicant is also guilty of laches , we are not inclined to order payment of either interest or costs.

and M.A.

8. The application is disposed of with above directions.

R.C. Bhatt

(R.C. Bhatt)

Member (J)

N.V. Krishnan
7.10.92

(N.V. Krishnan)

Vice Chairman

*AS.