

Central Administrative Tribunal Lucknow Bench Lucknow

Original Application No. 60/12

This, the 1st day of April, 2013

Hon'ble Mr. Navneet Kumar, Member (J)

C. N. Dubey, aged about 65 years, son of Shri Shiv Murat Dubey
resident of 568/223-Kha, Gitapalli, Allambagh, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate Sri Praveen Kumar.

Versus

1. Union of India through the General Manager, Northern Railway, Baroda Hose, New Delhi.
2. The Dy. Chief Engineer/Bridge, Bridge Workshop, Northern Railway, Charbagh, Lucknow.

Respondents

By Advocate Sri Rajendra Singh.

Order(Dictated in Open Court)

By Hon'ble Mr. Navneet Kumar, Member (J)

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and perused the record.

2. The present O.A. has been preferred by the applicant under Section 19 of the Central Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.

3. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant was initially appointed as Store Man in grade of Rs. 210-270 and thereafter, he was promoted to the post of Material Checker and after rendering satisfactory services, he was retired from the posts of Head Clerk after attaining the age of superannuation. The learned counsel for the applicant categorically pointed out that he has preferred an O.A. for quashing the order dated 25.10.2010 which was served upon him along with letter dated 15.11.2010. the said order was in regard to perma fixation of the applicant.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has pointed out and submitted a copy of the order dated 24.8.2012 whereby, a letter has been written to the Dy. CE/Bridge, Northern Railway, Lucknow in regard to taking decision on the perma fixation which may be given to the applicant and their pension may be revised accordingly. Learned counsel for the applicant has also pointed out that no further action has been taken by the respondents on this letter dated 24.8.12 (which is taken on record). As such, suitable direction may be given to the respondents to take an action and decide the grievance of the applicant within a stipulated period of time.

5. Considering the averments made by the learned counsel for the parties, I am of the considered view that the ends of justice would be met if a direction is given to the respondents to take a decision on the respondents letter dated 24.8.12 in regard to perma fixation of the applicant also to revised the pensionary benefits of the applicant in accordance with law. The

respondents may take a decision within a period of three months in accordance with law and the decision so taken, be communicated to the applicant.

6. With the above observation, the O.A. stands disposed off.
No order as to costs.


(Navneet Kumar)
Member (J)

vidya