

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 207/96

DATE OF DECISION: 9/01/2001

Shri K.K. Sharma

Applicant.

-----Advocate for
Applicant.

Versus

Union of India & 2 Ors

-----Respondents.

Shri V.G. Rege

-----Advocate for
Respondents.

ODRAM:

Hon'ble Shri Kuldip Singh Member (J)
Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastri Member (A)

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
2. Whether it needs to be circulated to
other Benches of the Tribunal?
3. Library.

ku
(KULDIP SINGH)
MEMBER (J)

abp

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:289/1996
DATED THE 9th OF JAN. 2001**

**CORAM:HON'BLE SHRI KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE SMT. SHANTA SHASTRY, MEMBER(A)**

1. Shri Kaushal Kumar Sharma,
General Secretary,
Government Medical Stores Factory,
Employees Union,
Dintimkar Road, Byculla,
Bombay - 400 008.

2. Shri S.M.Singh,
Assistant Chemist,
Near Old Hill Quarters,
Adarsh Nagar,
Goregaon (East),
Bombay.

... Applicant

V/s.

1. The Union of India,
Through: The Under Secretary to
the Government of India,
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare,
Government of India,
Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi

2. The Director General of Health Services,
Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi.

3. The Assistant Director General,
Government Medical Stores Department,
Dintimkar Road,
Byculla,
Bombay - 400 008.

... Respondents

By Advocate Shri V.G.Rege

(ORAL) (ORDER)

Per Shri Kuldip Singh, Member(A).

The petitioners in this case were working as Assistant Chemists have filed application seeking following reliefs:-

8(a) Direct the respondents by a suitable order to grant the applicants the same pay scale granted to Assistant Chemists at Calcutta by the order dated July,93 at Annexure-A that is in the scale of Rs.1600-2600 w.e.f. July,93 with arrears.

...2.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted, after the Vth Pay Commission, the officers are being given the same scale i.e. 1600-2600 at both places at Calcutta as well as at Bombay. Since the earlier work study was not conducted at Bombay, the scale was granted to Calcutta office and not granted to Bombay office.

3. There is no change in circumstances of the applicant with that of the applicants in OA-6/95 before the Calcutta Bench of the Tribunal and vide judgement dated 12/4/2000, the OA has been allowed. We find the same judgment applies to the present case and there is no justification to deny the same payscale to the applicants who were working at Bombay when all other recruitment rules, qualification, etc are same. Following the earlier case we also allow the case, and we restrict the arrears to past one year from the date of filing of OA. Accordingly OA is disposed of. No costs.

Shanta S
(SHANTA SHASTRY)

MEMBER(A)

Kul
(KULDIP SINGH)
MEMBER(J)

abp.