

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

O. A. No. 260/00192 OF 2016  
Cuttack, this the 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016

CORAM  
**HON'BLE MR. A.K. PATNAIK, MEMBER (J)**

Sribatsa Nayak, aged about 40 years, S/O- Late Govind Chandra Nayak,  
At/EXR 177, Chhend Colony, Phase-I, Rourkela, Dist- Sundargarh.

.....Applicant

By the Advocate(s)-M/s. S. B. Mohanty, S. Mohapatra.

-Versus-

**Union of India represented through**

1. Chairman, Steel Authority of India Ltd. Ispat Bhawan, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
2. Managing Director, Rourkela Steel Plant, At/Po-Rourkela, Dist- Sundargarh.
3. Executive Director (P & A), Rourkela Steel Plant, At/Po-Rourkela, Dist- Sundargarh.

.....Respondents

By the Advocate(s)-M/s. J. Pattnaik, T.K. Pattnaik,

**O R D E R (ORAL)**

**A.K.PATNAIK, MEMBER (J):**

Heard Mr. S.B. Mohanty, Ld. Counsel appearing for the applicant and Mr. T.K. Pattnaik, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. J. Pattnaik,, Ld. Sr. Counsel for the Respondents-SAIL on whom a copy of this O.A. has already been served, and perused the materials placed on record.

2. This O.A. has been filed by the applicant under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

“...To quash the impugned order dated 21.03.08 communicated to the applicant on 24.03.08 issued by the Executive Director (P&A) Rourkela Steel Plant.

Or in alternative to direct the respondents to dispose of the Mercy petition dated 20.07.2014 addressed to the Executive Director keeping in view the latest information supplied to the applicant on 14.06.2014 by the Dy. Manager regarding extension of same benefit to 92 dependents of RSP employees dying on 3<sup>rd</sup> priority/contingencies as engrafted under the Rehabilitations Policy.

*Wll*

Direct the Respondents to issue appointment order on compassionate measure as per the Rehabilitation Policy of SAIL keeping in view the informative order of the Dy. Manager dated 14.06.2014 within a time frame to the applicant in order to save the family of the deceased from distressed condition.”

3. Mr. Mohanty, Ld. Counsel submitted that due to non-consideration of the case of the applicant for the aforesaid relief, he submitted Mercy Petition dated 20.07.2014 (Annexure-A/8) to Respondent No.3. It has further been submitted that till date no response has been received by the applicant on his representation. Hence, the applicant has filed this O.A. with the prayer as aforesaid.

4. As stated by Ld. Counsel for the applicant that the representation of the applicant is pending with the authorities since 20.07.2014, I am of the view that right to know the result of the representation that too at the earliest opportunity is a part of compliance of principles of natural justice. The employer is also duty bound to look to the grievance of the employee and respond to him in a suitable manner, without any delay. In the instant case, as it appears, though the applicant submitted representation ventilating his grievance on 20.07.2014, he has not received any reply till date. It is apt for us to place reliance on the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of S.S.Rathore-Vrs-State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR1990 SC Page 10/1990 SCC (L&S) Page 50 (para 17) in which it has been held as under:

“17. .... Redressal of grievances in the hands of the departmental authorities take an unduly long time. That is so on account of the fact that no attention is ordinarily bestowed over these matters and they are not considered to be governmental business of substance. This approach has to be deprecated and authorities on whom power is vested to dispose of the appeals and revisions under the Service Rules must dispose of such matters as expeditiously as possible. Ordinarily, a period of three to six months should be the outer limit. That would discipline the system and keep the public servant away from a protracted period of litigation.”

*W.M*

5. In view of the above, while deprecating the action of the Respondent No.3 for the delay in disposal of the representation of the applicant, without entering into the merit of the matter, I dispose of this OA, at this admission stage with a direction to the Respondent No.3 to consider the representation dated 20.07.2014 (Annexure-A/8) and dispose of the same with a reasoned and speaking order to be communicated to the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. I hope and trust, in the event of such consideration if the applicant is found to be entitled to the relief claimed by him then expeditious steps be taken to extend the benefit to him preferably within a further period of three months from such consideration. Though I have not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case, I make it clear that all the points raised in the representation will be kept open for the Respondents for consideration as per the extant rules, regulations and law in force. However, it is made clear that if in the meantime the said representation has already been disposed of then the result of the same be communicated to the applicant within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission itself. No costs.

7. On the prayer made by Mr. S.B. Mohanty, Ld. Counsel appearing for the applicant, copy of this order, along with paper book, be sent to Respondent No. 3 by Speed Post for which Mr. Mohanty undertakes to file the postal requisites by 20.04.2016.

  
(A.K.PATNAIK)  
MEMBER(J)

K.B