

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No. 53/2000

Monday this the 17th day of January, 2000

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. J.L. NEGI, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

V. Karthikeyan,  
Post Graduate Teacher (Hindi)  
K.V. Newsprint Nagar,  
PO. Newsprint Nagar,  
Kottayam District. 686616.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. N.N.Sugunapalan (rep.))

V.

1. The Principal,  
Kendriya Vidyalaya Newsprint Nagar,  
PO. Newsprint Nagar, Kottayam District  
Pin. 686 616.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,  
The Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan,  
Chennai Regional Officer,  
IIT Campus, Chennai.36.
3. Union of India, represented by the  
Secretary to the Department of Pension,  
Personnel and Grievances,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi. ...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr. Sreekumar rep. Mr. T.B. Radhakrishnan)

The application having been heard on 17.1.2000, the  
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following;

O R D E R

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

The applicant who joined the Kendriya Vidyalaya  
Sangathan in 1973 after serving the State of Kerala for  
eleven years eleven months made a representation to the  
second respondent on 27.9.1999 requesting that while  
finalising his pension papers his services in the  
Education Department of the State of Kerala may also be  
treated as qualifying service for pension. This he had  
made as he is to retire within one year, submits the  
counsel.

...2

2. Finding that there is no response to this representation the applicant has filed this application for a direction to the second respondent to consider and dispose of the Annexure.AI representation dated 27.9.99 in accordance with the rules and circulars in that behalf.

3. When the application came up for hearing, Shri T.B.Radhakrishnan appeared for the respondents. The counsel agreed that the application may be disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the A.I representation of the applicant in accordance with the rules and instructions on the subject and to give an appropriate reply within a reasonable time.

4. In the result, as agreed to by the counsel on either side, the application is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the Annexure.AI representation of the applicant in the light of the rules and instructions on the subject and to give the applicant an appropriate reply within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 17th day of January, 2000

*J.L.NEGI*  
J.L.NEGI  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

*A.V. HARIDASAN*  
A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

List of Annexure referred to:

|ks| Annexure.AI: True copy of the representation submitted by the applicant to the 2nd respondent.