

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 331 of 2004

Tuesday, this the 27th day of July, 2004

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. H.P. DAS, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. T.N. Ramachandran Iyer,
(Retired General Store Keeper,
Government of India Press, Koratty),
Lakshmi Sadan, 7 Jawahar Park,
Nethajee Nagar, Ernakulam, Kochi,
Kerala - 682 020Applicant

[Party-in-person]

Versus

1. Union of India represented by the
Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment
(Department of Urban Development),
Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi - 110 011
2. The Under Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Department of Administrative Reforms
and Public Grievances, 5th Floor,
Sardar Patel Bhavan, Parliament Street,
New Delhi - 110 001Respondents

[By Advocate Mrs. Rajeswari A, ACGSC]

The application having been heard on 27-7-2004, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

No statement has been filed by the respondents.

2. Shri T.N.Ramachandran Iyer, who retired from the
service on 28-2-1987, has filed this application seeking the
following reliefs:-

- "A. For adjudicating the authority i.e. Secretary or Joint Secretary competent to dispose of the Applicant's Annexure A.2 representation on behalf of the Union of India represented by the Secretary as per directions contained in para 13 of Annexure A.1 order dated 9-2-1990.
- B. For adjudicating whether the Affidavit dated 7-3-1991 is true in the light of contradiction contained in para 2, 4 and 5 of the Annexure A.11 representation dated 24-1-03 on the basis of which CCP 39/99 in OA No.K 245/87 was dismissed vide order dated 12-4-1991 (Annexure A.11 (7 - 8)).
- C. For adjudicating whether the undated statement from the Member Secretary (Annexure A.6 (2 - 7)) was obtained in accordance with the directions contained in para 13 of Annexure A.1 order dated 9-2-1990.
- D. Direct the competent authority to dispose of the Applicant's A.2 representation after taking into consideration the observations contained in para 12 and directions contained in para 13 of Annexure A.1 order.
- E. Direct the respondents to reply the Applicant's A.11 representation dated 24-1-03.
- F. Award cost.
- G. Any other relief this Honourable Tribunal deems fit to grant."

3. We have gone through the application in detail and we have also seen all the annexures appended thereto. We find that the applicant does not have any subsisting or legitimate grievance that calls for redressal. The grievance of the applicant regarding fixation of pay has already been redressed by an order of this Tribunal. The claim now put forward by the applicant appears to be imaginative, speculative and experimental. The applicant it appears claims redressal of a grievance which is no more in existence now for he has been told a decade back that the issue has been considered and decision had been taken at the appropriate level. Under these circumstances, we do not find anything in this application

~

..3..

which calls for its admission and further deliberation. Hence, the application is rejected under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. No costs.

Tuesday, this the 27th day of July, 2004

H. P. Das

H.P. DAS
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

Ak.