

**Central Administrative Tribunal Lucknow Bench Lucknow.**

**Original Application No. 82/2006.**

**This, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2006.**

Narendra Bahadur Singh aged about 61 years son of late Shri Mahesh Narain Singh resident of House No. 2186, Mohalla Vivek Nagar, Near Hanuman Mandir, Sitapur.

Applicant.

By Advocate Shri S. P. Singh.

Versus

1. Union of India, through General Manager, Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi
2. Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Hazratganj, Lucknow.
3. Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, Northern Railway, Hazratganj, Lucknow.
4. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, Northern Railway, Hazratganj, Lucknow.
5. Divisional Commercial Manager, Northern Railway, hazratganj, Lucknow.

Respondents.

By Advocate Shri Praveen Kumar for Shri C.B. Verma.

**ORDER(ORAL)**

**BY HON'BLE SHRI A.K. BHATNAGAR, MEMBER (J)**

By this O.A., the applicant has prayed for following reliefs:

- i) to issue an appropriate order or direction setting aside the impugned order dated 31.1.96 passed by the respondent No. 5 contained as Annexure No. 4
- ii) to issue an appropriate order or direction directing the respondent No. 1 to fix the correct pay of the applicant for the purpose of fixation of correct pension from 1<sup>st</sup> July 1996.
- iii) to issue an appropriate order or direction directing the respondent to pay the arrears of retiral dues after re fixing the correct pay of the applicant with an interest of 18% per annum.



2. According to the applicant's counsel the applicant retired as Coaching Supervisor after attaining the age of superannuation on 30.11.2004. The main grievance of the applicant is inaction of the part of the respondents for not allowing the increment accrued to the applicant on 1.7.1996. Having felt aggrieved, he is stated to have sent a representation filed as Annexure 4 dated 28.12.2005 to the respondents but no action has so far been taken. Learned counsel further submitted that the present matter pertains to the refixation of pension of the applicant and no Counter Affidavit has yet been filed in this case by the respondents. So the applicant who is a retired person shall feel satisfied, if his representation Annexure -4 followed by reminder Annexure -6 is decided by the competent authority by a reasoned order as per rules.

3. After hearing the counsel for the parties and without going into the merits of the case, I am of the view that interest of justice shall better be served if the representation is decided by the competent authority within a stipulated period. Therefore, this O.A. is being disposed of at the admission stage itself by issuing a direction to the competent authority i.e. Respondent No. 3 to decide the representation of the applicant Annexure 4 as per rules by a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. For convenience sake and for early decision in the matter, the O.A. itself may be treated as part of the representation. No order as to costs.

  
(A. K. BHATNAGAR)

MEMBER(J)