

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CALCUTTA BENCH

O.A. No. 7 of 1996

Present : Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Chatterjee, Vice-Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. M.S. Mukherjee, Administrative Member

Purna Chandra Das, s/o Late Kalinarayan Das,
residing at 22, Beniapukur Lane, Calcutta-14,
Ex-Sr.Draftsman, in the office of the Director
of Inspection, 225C, A.J.C. Bose Road, Cal-20.

..... Applicant

-Versus-

1. Union of India, service through the
Secretary, Govt. of India, Deptt. of Supply
& Disposal, Nirman Bhavan, 'C' Wing, New Delhi ;
2. Director General, Supply & Disposal, N.I.
Bldgs., Parliament Street, New Delhi - 110 001 ;
3. Director of Inspection, 234/4, A.J.C. Bose
Road, Calcutta-20 ;
4. Assistant Director (Admn), Office of the
Director of Inspection, 234/4, A.J.C. Bose Rd.,
Calcutta-700 020.

..... Respondents

For applicant : Mr. S.K. Ghosh, counsel

For respondents : Ms. U. Sanyal, counsel

Heard on 28.8.1997

- Order on : 15.9.1997

O R D E R

A.K. Chatterjee, VC

The petitioner was initially appointed as a Tracer in 1955 in the office of the Director of Inspection, Calcutta and after successive promotions retired on 1.12.85 as a Sr.Draftsman. He has made the instant application claiming parity in the scale of pay as given to Tracer and Junior and Senior Draftsman in other Central Government Offices. He contends that even some Draftsman of the office of the Director of Inspection, Calcutta had filed an application in this Bench being O.A. 1377 of 1990, in which direction was given for revision of pay scale in the manner laid down in

the order itself. The petitioner contend that he is similarly circumstanced as the petitioners of O.A. 1377 of 1990 and prays for extension of benefit of that judgment to him. He had made representation for similar relief, which, however, was not granted and hence this application.

2. A reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents in which it is stated that the ^{afflicant} application is similarly circumstanced as the petitioners of O.A. 1377 of 1990 and he was given the benefit of existing orders on the subject notionally with effect from 13.5.82 and effectively from 1.11.83.

3. We have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and perused the records before us.

4. It is found from the judgment of O.A. 1377 of 1990 that notional benefit was given with effect from 22.8.73 and actual benefit from 16.11.78. The petitioner evidently wants such benefit which has not yet been extended to him. However, the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has fairly submitted that the question whether the petitioner was similarly circumstanced as the petitioners of the said O.A. is a question of fact which may be decided by the concerned authority and a suitable order in this regard may be passed.

5. In the circumstances as above, we consider it appropriate to dispose of the application with a direction upon the respondents, in particular upon the respondent No. 3 to treat the application and the annexures as a representation for the relief claimed therein and to dispose it of within eight weeks from the date of communication of this order by passing a reasoned order and benefit to which the petitioner may be entitled, shall be released within six weeks thereafter.

6. No order is, however, made as to costs.


(M.S. Mukherjee)
Member(A)


(A.K. Chatterjee)
Vice-Chairman