

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 355/2003.

this, the 1st day of August 2003.

HON. MR. A.K. BHATNAGAR MEMBER(J)

Raj Karan aged about 63 years Son of Late Jagdeo, Ex-welder under senior Saction Engineer (Permanent Way) Faizabad under the respondents and resident of Mohalla Kaushal Puri, City and District Faizabad.

....Applicant.

BY ADVOCATE SHRI A.C. MISRA.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through General Manager Northern Railway Headquarter of-fice, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. Divisional Railway Manager Northern Railway Divl. Officer Hazaratganj, Lucknow.
3. Senior Divisional Finance Manager, Northern Railway Divisional Office Hazaratganj, Lucknow.

....Respondents.

BY ADVOCATE SHRI PRAVEEN KUMAR B.H. FOR SHRI ANIL SRIVASTAVA.

ORDER(ORAL)

BY A.K. BHATNAGAR MEMBER(J)

BY this O.A., the applicant has prayed for a direction

Ae

to respondent No. 2 and 3 to restore the pay of the applicant to Rs. 4270/- which was drawn and paid in the month of June 2001, and reduced to Rs. 4190/- without any show cause notice. He has further prayed for a direction to respondent No. 2 and 3 to pay his DCRG Rs. 1,00,075/illegally reduced to Rs. 98864/- with interest @ 18% from 1.7.2001 to the date of payment. He has further prayed to direct the respondents for re-checking his P.F. account pay its difference of pension and leave encashment with interest with a revised pension of Rs. 2107/- instead of Rs. 2067/- W.E.F. 1.7.2001 and onward. The grievance of the applicant is that he retired on 30.6.2001, he has not been paid his retiral dues i.e. P.F. , commuted value of pension, DCRG, and leave encashment and his pay has illegally been reduced. The learned counsel for the applicant has pointed out that he has sent a representation to the DRM Northern Railway, Lucknow dated 28.12.2001 regarding the same, which has not yet been decided by the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents has filed the memo of appearance today in the court and sought time for filing the Counter Affidavit. I don't consider it necessary and the O.A. is finally decided at the admission stage. I consider it appropriate that the ends the justice will be met if the representation of the applicant dated 28.12.2001 (Annexure-5) is decided by reasoned and speaking order within a specified period. Accordingly, the Original Application is disposed of with the direction to the respondent No. 2 to decide the representation of the applicant dated 28.12.2001 (Annexure-5) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order. The applicant may file a detailed representation alongwith copy of this order to the respondents to expedite the matter within the given time frame.

3. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of as above without

AN ✓

any order as to costs.

At
MEMBER(J)

LUCKNOW: DATED: 1.8.2003.
V.