

(13)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 663/89

XXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

DATE OF DECISION 7th Sept 1993

Shri P.T. Mathew _____ Petitioner

Shri G.S. Walia _____ Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Director, Dept. of _____ Respondent
Electronics.

Shri V.S. Masurkar. _____ Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A)

The Hon'ble ~~Sixxx~~ Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

1. ~~Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?~~ N
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. ~~Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?~~
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? N

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

(6)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 663/89

Shri P.T. Mathew

... Applicant

V/s.

Director
Govt. of India
Dept. of Electronics
Plot No. F 7 & 8,
M.I.D.C. Area, Marol,
Andheri (E)
Bombay.

... Respondent.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Appearance:

Shri G.S. Walia, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri V.S. Masurkar, counsel
for the respondents.

JUDGEMENT

Dated: 7/9/93

(1) Per Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J) (1)

The applicant, Shri P.T. Mathew, who is working as Tradesman 'D' with Electronics Regional Test Laboratory (West) (ERTL(W)). Department of Electronics, has filed this application with respect to non-allotment of family accommodation under the relevant rules of allotment of temporary Government accommodation in ERTL (W). He has alleged that allotment of certain quarters which have been given to certain essential staff has been done arbitrarily and illegally and (2) he has been discriminated in respect of the allotment of the quarters.

On perusal of the reply given by the respondents and the relevant Rules it is seen that the allotment of the houses in question have been made in accordance with the extant Rules and Policy

to the eligible persons posted in ERTL (W). The main reason for allotment of the family quarters to Scientific and Technical persons was that they were recruited on an all India basis and they found acute difficulty to get suitable accommodation in Bombay. Since most of them will be fresh to Government service they will have to wait for years for their allotment of Central Government accommodation in their turn. Therefore, in order to attract and retain key Scientific and Electronic personnel at ERTL (W) special sanction had been obtained from the Headquarters at New Delhi for sanctioning residential accommodation to these persons. Later the administrative staff were also considered for allotment of these quarters. Accordingly in the administrative quota the staff car Driver who is senior most among the staff and whose services were very essential at any given time for the Laboratory had been allotted one of these quarters. The other persons to whom the houses have been given have also been satisfactorily explained in the reply filed by the respondents. We find that these have been done under the allotment Rules, based upon seniority, basic pay and marital status and hence legal and valid. The respondents have also stated that Mr. Mathew's application for family quarters will be considered in its turn.

In the above circumstances we find no merit in the application. The application is dismissed with no order as to costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
MEMBER (J)

M.Y. Priolkar
(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A)