

**Central Administrative Tribunal, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow**

**Original Application No. 401/2006**

This the 9th day of May 2008

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Khem Karan, Vice Chairman**

Mrs. S.J. Khan aged about 60 years wife of Sri Yaqoob Hasan, ex S.B. Supervisor, Military Exchange CSIR, Lucknow and resident of Gigarettes House, Nayaganj, East, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate: Sri Mohd Arif for Sri Mohd. Nasim

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
2. The P.C. D.A. , Central Command, Lucknow, Cantonment, Lucknow.
3. The Commanding Officer, CSIR at Lucknow..

Respondents

By Advocate; Sri K.K.Shukla

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**BY HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE KEHM KARAN, VICE CHAIRMAN**

Applicant, who retired on 30.6.2004, as S.B. Supervisor from the service of the respondents, has prayed for directing the opposite parties to refix his pay since 1996 in accordance with rules as indicated in Annexure -1 and also to pay balance of salary and pension and other benefits accordingly.

2. Her case in brief is that, she was initially inducted as CSBO in 1964 and in due course, was promoted to the post of S.B. Supervisor in 2004. She says that Chandigarh Bench of this Tribunal issued directions dated 27.2.2004 in O.A. No. 450/12002 for giving certain pay scale to the S.B. Supervisors and in implementation of those directions, pay scale was given to them but applicant was not rightly placed in the relevant pay scale. She says that she represented to the respondent No. 3, for rectifying the mistake



that occurred in fixation of applicant's pay but the same was pending and no decision was being taken.

3. Sri Mohd. Arif has informed during the course of argument that subsequently, pay of the applicant was fixed at Rs. 5850/- in the pay scale of Rs. 5500-9000 but it ought to have been at Rs. 6200/- and error in fixation of pay, has not been rectified in spite of the representation having been given to the authority concerned.

4. The respondents have filed reply saying that the O.A. is totally misconceived and deserves to be dismissed and they have also submitted that the applicant has already filed one O.A. No. 151/2004 and the same is pending.

5. I think, this O.A. can be disposed of with a provision that in case the applicant gives a detailed representation in regard to subsisting grievances, within a period of one month from today, respondent No. 2 will pass a suitable orders in accordance with rules within a period of 3 months from the date of representation is received. Ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

  
Vice Chairman 09.5.08

HLS/-