

6
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: CUTTACK BENCH

Original Application No. 702 of 1993

Date of Decision: 25.11.1994

Hari Sankar Bhaisa

Applicant(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondent(s)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

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


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

25 NOV 94

7

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: CUTTACK BENCH

Original Application No. 702 of 1993

Cuttack this the 26th day of November, 1994

C O R A M:

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

...

Sri Hari Sankar Bhaisa,
Retired Railway Guards,
At: Kapumal - Teteguda
PO: Jharsuguda
Dist: Sambalpur

... Applicant/s

By the Advocate Shri J. N. Jethi

Versus

1. Union of India, represented by
the General Manager,
South Eastern, Railway
Garden Reach, Calcutta

2. The Divisional Railway Manager
S.E. Railway, Chakradharpur,
PO: Chakradharpur
Dist: Singhbhum (Bihar)

3. The Divisional Personnel Officer
S.E. Railways, Chakradharpur
Dist: Singhbhum (Bihar)

... Applicant/s

By the Advocate: Shri D. N. Mishra,
Standing Counsel (Rly)

...

O R D E R

MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN); Shri Hari Shankar Bhaisa, the

applicant, was a Railway Guard and retired on superannuation on 31st January, 1992, from Jharsuguda Division in the South Eastern Railway. He had approached this Tribunal on an earlier occasion with a prayer to direct the respondents to dispose of a representation that was pending at the time and further to direct them to allow him to inspect his leave account.

2. The grievance of the applicant then was that he was paid much less by way of leave encashment on his retirement

or conform to
— J. G. Edwards

half average pay, 'retrenchment' pay (whatever that means in his case), 'sick', and even casual leave besides what he calls 'unrecorded' leave and special casual leave, forgetting that it is the leave on average pay alone which can be encashed.

4. The applicant at one stage demanded the production of Guard's Roster, for what purpose it is not clear. On his part, the applicant said that he would produce some 'duty record' which he claimed he had maintained. It was never produced. The authorities are seen to have been more than helpful by acceding to every reasonable request ^{to} and also some demands which smack of irrelevance if not of actual whimsicality.

There is absolutely no merit at all in the petitioner's claims, no rule to support and no record to substantiate them. This is a confused claim and wholly unentertainable.

The application is dismissed.


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

25 Nov 94

B.K.Sahoo//