

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.449/99

Wednesday, this the 30th day of June, 1999.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR G.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Leena.T.P.
Junior Hindi Translator,
Fisheries Survey of India,
Kochangadi,
Cochin-5.
2. P.R.Anandavally Amma,
Junior Hindi Translator,
Integrated Fisheries Project,
Foreshore Road,
Cochin-16.
3. K.Viswanathan,
Senior Hindi Translator,
Central Institute of Fisheries Nautical
Engineering Training(CIFNET),
Cochin. - Applicants

By Advocate Mr M.R.Rajendran Nair

Vs

1. Union of India represented by
its Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Finance,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General,
Fisheries Survey of India,
Mumbai.
3. The Director,
Integrated Fisheries Project,
Cochin-16.
4. The Director,
Central Institute of Fisheries,
Nautical Engineering Training(CIFNET),
Cochin. - Respondents

By Advocate Mr Shri Hari Rao, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 30.6.99, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicants 1&2 are Junior Hindi Translators and applicant No.3 is a Senior Hindi Translator working under the respondents. Their grievance is that while their counterparts in other departments like CPWD, Customs etc. are paid in the scale of pay Rs.1400-2600 and Rs.1640-2900 respectively for Junior and Senior Hindi Translators on implementation of the recommendation of the IVth Central Pay Commission, the applicants were left in a lower pay scale of Rs.1400-2300 and 1640-2660 and are given on implementation of the Vth Central Pay Commission only the replacement scale. Adverting to this grievance and stating that in similar circumstances this Tribunal in O.A.157/90 given a direction to the the respondents therein to extend the higher pay scale to Hindi Translators of the CPWD as also two other judgements, the applicants made individual representations A-1 to A-3 in October, 97. Finding that there is no response to these representations, the applicants have filed this application for the following reliefs:

"(i) To declare that the applicants are entitled to be granted the corresponding pay scale of Rs.1400-2600 and 1640-2900 on par with their counterparts in other departments with effect from the date of implementation of the IVth Pay Commission to grant the corresponding revised pay scale with effect from 1.1.96, with arrears together with interest at the rate of 18% per annum.

(ii) To direct the respondents to grant the pay scale of Rs.1400-2600 to the first and second applicants and the pay scale of 1640-2900 to the 3rd applicant with effect from the implementation of IVth Pay Commission and the corresponding revised pay scale with effect from 1.1.96, with arrears, together with arrears at the rate of 18% per annum."

2. When the matter came up for hearing, learned counsel for respondents states that the decision to extend a pay scale can be taken only by the first respondent and that if the applicant would make a representation to the first respondent, the same would be considered and disposed of within a reasonable time. Noting the above submission, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the application may be disposed of allowing the applicant to make a detailed representation to the first respondent and directing the first respondent to take appropriate decision within a reasonable time.

3. In the light of what is stated above and as agreed to by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of allowing the applicant to make a representation to the first respondent in regard to the grievance regarding pay scale and directing the first respondent that if such a representation is received from the applicants within one month from today, the same shall be considered and disposed of within a period of four months from the date of receipt of the representation. No costs.

Dated, the 30th of June, 1999.



(G.RAMAKRISHNAN)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



(A.V.HARIDASAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

trs/1799

List of Annexures referred to in the Order:

1. A-1: True copy of the representation dated 13.10.97 submitted by the 1st applicant to 2nd respondent.
2. A-2: True copy of the representation dated 16.10.97 submitted by the 2nd applicant to the 3rd respondent.
3. A-3: True copy of the representation dated 6.2.97 submitted by the 3rd applicant to the 4th respondent.