

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.539/2000

Thursday, this the 25th day of May, 2000.

CORAM:

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

HON'BLE MR G.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

A.S.Pillai,  
Assistant Engineer,  
MES No.304492,  
SO III E/M,  
Chief Engineer(Navy),  
Kochi - 682 004.

- Applicant

By Advocate Ms K Indu

Vs

1. Union of India represented by  
its Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi.
2. Engineer-in-Chief,  
Naval Head Quarters,  
Kashmir House,  
New Delhi-11.
3. The Central Record Office(Officers),  
O/o the Chief Engineer,  
Delhi Zone,  
Delhi.
4. The Chief Engineer,  
Southern Command,  
Pune - 411 001.
5. Mr.Madhurai Bastheegan,  
MES No.127776,  
Assistant Engineer, E/M GE(P),  
No.1, 9 ISRO Area,  
Vishakapatnam.

- Respondents

By Advocate Mr A.Sathianathan, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 25.5.2000, the Tribunal on  
the same day delivered the following:

..2..

O R D E R

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


The grievance of the applicant is that there has been an anomaly in fixation of his pay in comparison with that of the 5th respondent. The applicant's representation in this regard is pending though the 3rd respondent was convinced that there was an anomaly in fixing the pay of the applicant. The applicant has therefore filed this application praying for the following reliefs:

"(i) to direct the respondents 1 to 4 to refix the pay on par with the 5th respondent since from 1980 onwards and to grant all consequential benefits.

(ii) to direct the 3rd and 4th respondents to consider Annexure A3 representation taking into consideration of the spirit of the letter Annexure A2"

2. When the application came up for hearing today, Shri A. Sathianathan, ACGSC took notice on behalf of the official respondents. Learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant is not pressing for the prayer in sub paragraph(i) of Paragraph 8 of the application and that the applicant would be satisfied if the representation of the applicant A-3 is considered by the 4th respondent and an appropriate reply is given to him. As the representation A-3 is not addressed to the 4th respondent, the counsel on either side agreed that the applicant may be permitted to make a representation within one

..3...



month to the 4th respondent projecting his grievances in regard to the anomaly in fixation of pay and directing the 4th respondent to consider the representation in accordance with law and to give an appropriate reply to the applicant within a reasonable time.

3. In the result, in the light of the above submission made by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of permitting the applicant to make a representation to the 4th respondent within a month from today with regard to the anomaly in fixation of his pay vis-a-vis that of his junior, the 5th respondent and directing the 4th respondent that if such a representation is received within the said period, the same shall be considered in accordance with law and an appropriate reply is given to the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation. No costs.

Dated, the 25th of May, 2000.



G. RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

trs/25500

LIST OF ANNEXURES REFERRED TO IN THE ORDER:

- A-3: True copy of the representation dated 15.3.2000 submitted by the applicant to the 3rd respondent with a copy to the 4th respondent.
- A-2: True copy of the letter No.CRO/20/13/2542/2000 dated 4.2.2000 issued by the 3rd respondent.