

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A. No. 582/99

Thursday, this the 27th day of May, 1999.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR AV HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

P. Beebi,
Helper, Balavadi,
BAP Unit, Andrott.

...Applicant

By Advocate Mr. Thampan Thomas

Vs.

1. The Administrator,
Union Territory of Lakshadweep,
Kavaratti.
2. The Chairman,
Central Social Welfare Board,
New Delhi.
3. The Secretary,
Ministry of Social Welfare and
Cultural, Government of India,
New Delhi.
4. The Chairman,
Lakshadweep State Social Welfare
Advisory Board, Kavaratti.

...Respondents

By Advocate Mr. S. Radhakrishnan, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 27.5.99, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

HON'BLE MR AV HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant had been working as a helper, Balavadi under the fourth respondent since 1978 but was regularised only in the year 1981. In terms of the order dated 22.8.81 regarding Establishment Advisory Board and appointment of helpers, the Balavadi helpers are to get an honorarium of Rs. 100/- per month. Ever since then, the applicant has been getting remuneration @ Rs. 100/- per month though there has been increase

in workload and escalation of prices. The applicant made representations for enhancement of the rate of honorarium. By Annexure A-2 letter dated 23.4.85, the third respondent informed that the revision of honorarium was being considered. However, no enhancement has as yet been made. The applicant continued to make representations to the first and second respondents but without any response. Under these circumstances, the applicant has filed this application for a declaration that the applicant is entitled to the wages of Class-IV employee as a daily rated worker under the respondents and for a direction to the respondents to pay the applicant at that rate.

2. I heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant, Shri. Thampan Thomas and Shri.S. Radhakrishnan, the learned counsel for the respondents. It is highly unfortunate that a person is getting the same amount of remuneration for the same work from 1981 onwards, eventhough escalation in prices of commodities has been alarming. The respondents should have taken into account this fact as also the fact that there had been addition of workload and fixed the remuneration afresh. Counsel on either side agree that the application may be disposed of with an appropriate direction to the first respondent with regard to the disposal of the representation of the applicant regarding enhancement of remuneration made in A-4 within a time to be stipulated by the Tribunal.

3. In the light of the submissions made by the counsel on either side, the application is disposed of directing the first respondent to consider Annexure A-4 representation of the applicant keeping in view the escalation in prices of commodities during the period from 1981-99, the change in

the quantum of work assigned, the rules and instructions on the subject and all other relevant factors and to give the applicant an appropriate reply to the representation at Annexure A-4 within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Dated the 27th day of May, 1999.



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

nv
27599

LIST OF ANNEXURES REFERRED TO IN THE ORDER

1. Annexure A-2:

True copy of the Memo as per Order F.No.3/2/84-SWB dated 23.4.1985 issued by the fourth respondent.

2. Annexure A-4:

True copy of the representation dated 18.2.1999 submitted by the applicant before the first respondent.