

2
J-

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 526 of 1993

Read with MA.No.586/93

Date of Decision: 5.10.1993

Ashok Kumar Behura & Others Applicant(s)



Versus

Union of India & Others Respondent(s)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ?
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ?

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

05 Oct 93

VICE-CHAIRMAN

En 5/10/93

3
6
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 526 of 1993
Read with M.A. No. 596/93
Date of Decision: 5.10.1993

Ashok Kumar Behura & Others Applicant(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondent(s)

For the applicants: M/s.A.K.Bose
P.K.Giri,
Advocates

For the respondents: Mr.Ashok Mishra
Sr.Standing Counsel
(Central)

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR.K.P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN)

JUDGMENT

MR.K.P.ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN: In this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act,1985, the petitioner prays for a direction to be issued to the opposite parties to continue payment of wages to the petitioners on the basis of equal pay for equal work; and a direction to be given to the opposite parties not to reduce the wages of the petitioners at the rate of Rs.25/- per day and there has been some other prayers practically of similar nature.

2. We did not think it expedient in the interest of justice to keep this matter pending. It would suffice to say that the petitioners are said to be working as casual labourers in the Door Darshan Kendra, Bhubaneswar.

They had claimed higher wages which formed subject matter



of Original Application No.430 of 1990. This was disposed of on 7.7.1993.

3. We have heard Mr. AK Bose, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Ashok Mishra, learned Standing Counsel. Apart from the observations made in the Original Application No. 430 of 1990, we would direct that following the dictum laid down by Their Lordships in the case of *Dak Tar Mazdoor Manch vs. Union of India & Others* reported in AIR 1987 SC 2342 that the casual labourers must be paid the basic pay scale of a Group D employee with ^{by} ~~by~~ increments. 1.4.2000
4. Accordingly, the entitlement of the petitioners be calculated and paid to each of them for the period they have actually rendered service. Thus the Original Application No. 526 of 1993 along with Misc. Application No. 596 of 1993 are accordingly disposed of. No costs.

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

05 OCT 93

Central Administrative Tribunal
Cuttack Bench Cuttack
dated the 5.10.1993/ B.K. Sahoo

VICE-CHAIRMAN

5/10/93

