

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.6/06

Friday this the 6th day of January 2006

C O R A M :

HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

Sabhapathy G.,
S/o.Ganeshan,
Valve Man, C/o.G.E.Army,
Tirumala P.O., Trivandrum – 6.
P.467/3, MES Quarters,
Tirumala P.O. Trivandrum.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.M.R.Hariraj)

Versus

1. The Director General (Personnel),
Engineer in Chief, Branch, Army Head Quarters,
Kashmir House, New Delhi – 110 011.
2. Garrison Engineer, Army, Tirumala P.O.,
Trivandrum – 695 006.
3. Union of India represented by
the Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.T.P.M.Ibrahim Khan,SCGSC)

This application having been heard on 6th January 2006 the Tribunal
on the same day delivered the following :-

ORDER

HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant is working as a Valve Man in the office of G.E.(Army),
Tirumala (2nd respondent). He is aggrieved by the alleged denial of HBA.
He submitted that he has made a request for HBA in the year 2002 duly
furnishing all the documents required. Though all the documents were
forwarded the applicant had been asked to submit further details like
indemnity bond etc. Hence he has submitted another representation at
Annexure A-11 in response to which he was served with Annexure A-13

.2.

order asking for further information. It is further submitted that his request is being denied on some filmsy grounds.

2. On persual of the documents brought before me I find that the applicant had originally produced the agreement deed in 2002 and had submitted the indemnity bond in the year 2004. It is true that there has been some delay in consideration of his case but whatever has been happened it is in the past now his case is under consideration in the year 2005. The respondents have by Annexure A-13 order intimated him that he has to renew the agreement afresh and also furnish certain certificates. The applicant has not complied with this direction and has now approached this Tribunal by filing this O.A. Since his case has not been finally rejected by the authorities I am of the view that the application can be disposed of by directing the applicant to resubmit his reply to the communication at Annexure A-13 along with all required documents within two weeks and on receipt of the same the 2nd respondent shall consider his request in accordance with rules and communicate a decision to the applicant within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the reply. I accordingly do so. The O.A is disposed of at the admission stage itself. No order as to costs.

(Dated the 6th day of January 2006)

Sathianair

SATHI NAIR
VICE CHAIRMAN

asp