

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 452/2003.

this, the 18th day of December 2003.

HON'BLE SHRI SARWESHWAR JHA MEMBER(A)

HON'BLE SMT. SHYAMA DOGRA MEMBER(J)

R.S.Shukla aged about 61 years, Son of Late Vidyadhar
Shukla Resident of 4/137, Vikas Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow
226010.

... Applicant.


BY ADVOCATE SHRI B. SINGH FOR SHRI SHIVJI SHUKLA

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of
Information and Broad casting 'A' Wing, Shastri
Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Director General (News) News Service Division-
AIR, Prasar Bharti Corporation, Akashwani Bhawan,
Parliament Street, New Delhi.
3. Pay and Accounts Officer (IRLA), Ministry of Infor
mation and Broadcasting, AGCR Building, New Delhi.

... Respondents.

BY ADVOCATE SHRI D. AWASTHI FOR SHRI G.S. SIKARWAR.


ORDER (ORAL)

BY SHRI SARWESHWAR JHA MEMBER(A)

on perusal of the Original Application, and the material available on record, it is observed that the applicant has already submitted representations to the respondents from time to time and the same have been disposed of by the respondents. It is also observed that the applicant has claimed pensionary benefits with reference to the post of Senior Administrative Grade of the Indian Information Service Group 'A' to which the applicant was promoted, but the benefit of which is most arbitrarily and discriminatorily being denied to the applicant, where as one Shri Ramji Tripathi and also a few individual officers, who, according to him, were appointed to the said Grade after his own proforma promotion to the Senior Administrative Grade of the service, have been allowed the said benefit. It appears that the respondents have examined the case of the applicant with reference to the case of Shri Ramji Tripathi who retired on 28.2.2002, whereas the applicant retired on 31.5.2002. It is also observed that the other individual officers, who have been named by the applicant in his application and who have also been given the benefit of retiral benefits with reference to the posts in the Senior Administrative Grade of the Service, also held the said posts on proforma basis. We do not, therefore, find any material on record why these benefits cannot be given to the applicant, giving appropriate consideration with reference to the cases of the individual officers that he has named in the O.A.

2. We are, therefore, of the considered view that the respondents be directed to treat this O.A. as another representation of the applicant and to dispose^{it} of by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of communication of this order. They may also consider giving benefit of retirement ^{due to} to the applicant if his case, on verification and reconsideration, is found to be similar to the ones referred to by the applicant in his O.A.

3. The O.A. thus stands disposed of in terms of the above directions. No costs.

MEMBER(J)

MEMBER(A)