

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 234 of 2003

Monday, this the 24th day of March, 2003

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. T.N.T. NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE MR. K.V. SACHIDANANDAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

1. M. Sreedharan,
J/E, 1159, Electrical Khalasi Helper,
Coimbatore, residing at Kannath House,
Mathur East, PO Mathur,
Palakkad - 678 571Applicant

[By Advocate M/s K. Ramkumar & Associates]

Versus

1. Union of India, represented by the
General Manager, Southern Railway,
Chennai.
2. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway, Palakkad.Respondents

[By Advocate Mr. Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil]

The application having been heard on 24-3-2003, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR. T.N.T. NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

The applicant is working as Electrical Khalasi Helper at Coimbatore under the Palghat Division of the Southern Railway. Claiming himself that he had been carrying out the duties and responsibilities of a skilled labourer, the applicant had approached the Railway Grievance Adalat at Coimbatore for grant of higher pay scales to which the skilled labourer was eligible. He was apparently asked to furnish full details regarding his engagement as a skilled labourer. The applicant claims to have furnished the details. But the respondents have not taken any further action so far. The applicant has been representing the matter vide A1 and A2 and finally by A3 representation dated 16-12-2002. Since no action

has been taken in the matter and since many of those similarly placed skilled workers have received the benefit of higher pay scale, the applicant has filed this OA with the following prayers:-

- "a) Direct the respondents to grant the applicant pay on a higher scale from the year 1982 onwards.
- b) Direct the respondents to pass appropriate orders considering Annexures A1 to A3 representations."

2. When the matter came up for admission, Shri Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil took notice for the respondents and sought time to get instructions and to file a statement in the matter. However, when it was pointed out by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant would be satisfied if A3 representation dated 16-12-2002 was disposed of having regard to the fact that other similarly placed persons were also given the same benefit, the learned counsel for respondents has agreed that this course of action can be taken and the respondents would consider A3 representation dated 16-12-2002 along with any other supporting material which the applicant would like to furnish within a time frame.

3. In view of the above submissions, we consider it appropriate to dispose of the Original Application by permitting the applicant to furnish a copy of A3 representation, if it is not already with the respondents, along with any other further documentary material which he would like to place reliance on, within a period of two weeks from today and directing the respondents to dispose of the same by making a considered and speaking order within a period of

..3..

two months from the date on which the copy of the representation along with the additional material, if any, is furnished by the applicant.

4. The Original Application is disposed of as aforesaid.
No order as to costs.

Monday, this the 24th day of March, 2003



K.V. SACHIDANANDAN
JUDICIAL MEMBER



T.N.T. NAYAR
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Ak.