

3

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK**

**O. A. NO. 321 OF 2013
CUTTACK, THIS THE 24th DAY OF MAY, 2013**

**CORAM
HON'BLE SHRI R.C.MISRA, MEMBER (ADMN.)**

.....
Pulungi Tudu,
aged about 37 years,
Widow of Late Durga Tudu,
Ex-Cabin Master/BTV,
Resident of
Vill-Ambrutia, P.O. Barundei,
Dist- Jajpur, Odisha.

...Applicant

(Advocate(s) : M/s. N.R.Routray, Smt. J. Pradhan, T.K.Choudhury, S.K.Mohanty)

VERSUS

Union of India Represented through

1. General Manager, East Coast Railwlay,
E.Co.R.Sadan, Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar, Dist- KHURDA.
2. Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer/
East Coast Railway, Khurda Road Division,
At/PO- Jatni, Dist- Khurda.
3. Sr. Divisional Operating Manager/
East Coast Railway, Khurda Road Division,
At/PO- Jatni, Dist. Khurda.
4. Sr. Divisional Financial Manger/
East Coast Railway, Khurda Road Division,
At/PO- Jatni, Dist- Khurda.
5. Chief Personnel Officer/
E.Co.Rly/E.Co.R. Sadan,
Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar,
Dist- Khurda.
6. Chanmuni Tudu,
W/o- Late Durga Tudu,
Ex-Cabin Master/BTV at Chakuapala,
P.O./Via- Hatigarh, P.S. Raibania,
Dist.-Balasore, Odisha.

... Respondents

(Advocate: Mr. T. Rath)

Q
niv

ORDER

SHRI R.C.MISRA, MEMBER (ADMN.) :

Heard Shri N.R.Routray, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, and Shri T.Rath, Ld. Standing Counsel representing the Respondent-Railways, at length.

2. At this point of admission, I find that there is a representation made by the applicant on 06.08.2012 to the Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, E.Co.Railways, who is Respondent No.2 in the O.A, and the Railway authorities have so far not considered this application and not given any ^{on} reply to this to the applicant.

3. It is further observed that the Hon'ble Apex Court in S.S.Rathore vs State of Madhya Pradesh, reported in 1990 SCC (L&S) 50 has observed as under regarding disposal of representation by departmental authorities:

“Redressal of grievances in the hands of the departmental authorities takes 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 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”.

4. In view of the above, at this point, without going into the merit of this case, I direct Respondent No.2 to consider the representation and

Q
~

dispose of it by a reasoned and speaking order and communicate the same to the applicant within the next 90 days.

5. Accordingly, the Original Application is disposed of at the stage of admission.

6. Copy of this order along with paper book be sent to the Respondent Nos. 2 and 4. Free copies of this order be also made over to the Ld. Counsels appearing for both the parties.


(R.C.MISRA)
MEMBER (Admn.)

RK