

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: CUTTACK BENCH

Original Application No. 10 of 1995

Cuttack this the 7th day of December, 1995

Niranjan Pal ... Applicant(s)

• • •

Applicant(s)

Versus

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 Tribunal or not ?

G
(P.V. VENKATKRISHNAN)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

Y
8
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: CUTTACK BENCH

Original Application No. 10 of 1995

Cuttack this the 7th day of December, 1995

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR .P.V .VENKATKR ISHAN, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

...

Niranjan Pal
S/o.Jagannath pal
Chief Parcel Clerk
Bhubaneswar

...

Applicant

By the Advocate:

M/s.Akhil Mohapatra
R.C.Sahoo
H.N.Mall

Versus

1. Union of India,
represented by General Manager,
South Eastern Railways,
Garden Reach, Calcutta-43
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
South Eastern Railways,
At/PO:Khurda Road, Dist:Khurda
3. Senior Divisional Commercial Manager
South Eastern Railways,
At/PO:Khurda Road, Dist:Khurda
4. Assistant Engineer,
South Eastern Railways,
At/PO:Bhubaneswar Railway Station
Dist :Khurda
5. Gurubari Das,
Head Goods Clerk, Bhubaneswar
Railway Station, Bhubaneswar
Dist:Khurda

...

Respondents

By the Advocate(s):

Mr.Ashok Mohanty
for Res. 1 & 3

Mr.P.C .Mohapatra
for Res. 5

...

O R D E R

MR .P.V .VENKATKR ISHAN, MEMBER (ADMN) : Applicant who is a Chief
Parcel Clerk Gr. II, reported for duty at Bhubaneswar

on 29.7.1994 and applied for allotment of quarters on 12.8.1994. Respondent 5 joined as Head Goods Clerk Bhubaneswar on 8.3.1993 and applied for allotment of quarters on 27.3.1994. From 8.11.1994, Respondent 5 was also discharging the duties of Chief Goods Clerk Supervisor. The grievance of the applicant is that Respondent 5 was allotted quarters while he was not despite he being Senior to Respondent-5. The learned counsel for the respondents state that the criterion for allotment of quarters is not mere seniority, but also essentiality as seen from Annexure-6 produced by the applicant. Respondents have furnished a list of categories of staff to be considered 'essential' for the purpose of housing vide Annexure-R/1. In this list I find Head Goods Clerk and Head Parcel Clerk listed, but not Chief Parcel Clerk Gr.II. It appears that Respondent 5 falls within the 'essential' category of staff for the purpose of housing whereas applicant does not fall under the essential category. Besides, Respondent 5 has applied for allotment of quarters prior to applicant. As pointed out by the learned counsel for the respondents, the question of seniority between two different categories does not arise and it would not be correct to term Respondent 5 as junior to the applicant. However, the scheme for allotment of quarters recognises a seniority of total service in Class III as a criterion for allotment of Type-II quarters for Class-III staff and total Class IV

service is ~~only~~ the criterion for allotment of Type-I
quarters to Class-IV Staff. I do not find anything in
the pleadings to show that applicant has a longer length
of service in Class-III.

2. Under the circumstances I see no merit in
the application. It is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

P. Venkatakrishna
(P.V. VENKATKRISHNAN)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

B.K. Sahoo//