

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.359/2001

Date of Decision: 28.5.2001

CORAM: HON'BLE SHRI SHANKAR RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Shri Maruti Ragho Channe,
DOS Grade II (Group C)
Central Excise
Mumbai II, Commissionerate,
9th floor, Piramal Chambers,
Parel Lalbaug, Mumbai 400 012.

... Applicant

(Applicant by Shri S.P.Inamdar, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Union of India through
The Chief Commissioner of Central Excise,
New Central Excise Bldg.,
M.K. Road, Opp. Churchgate Rly. Stn.
Mumbai 400 020.

2. The Commissioner of Central Excise,
Mumbai I Commissionerate,
Central Excise (Audit),
Mumbai II Commissionerate,
9th floor, Piramal Chambers,
Parel Lalbaug, Mumbai 400 012.

.... Respondents

(Respondents by ~~Shri~~ None)

ORDER (ORAL)

Per: Shankar Raju, Member (J):

Present Shri S.P.Inamdar, learned Counsel for the Applicant.

2. The Applicant in this O.A. has sought the relief in para 8.1 to

8.8. Since the Applicant's Counsel has ^{restricked his} prayed for a direction to

Respondents to dispose of the representation of the Applicant, I

deal with this matter having jurisdiction under the Notification of 4-4-2000

issued under ^{Section 6 of Section 5} Rule 15 (A) of the ~~CAT~~ Procedural Rules of A.T. Act 1985.

3. The Applicant belonging to SC Community has alleged that despite having 7 posts of Inspectors of Central Excise lying vacant during the period 25-2-1997 to 25-2-2000 the same have not been filled in by convening DPC in the year 1999. The Applicant who belongs to SC category needs to be considered under reserved quota for SC. It is

further alleged that a list has been prepared by the Respondents to conduct physical test of Tax Assistant/Stenographer Grade II who have passed the Departmental Promotion Exam. to the Grade Inspector in terms of the eligibility as on 1.1.1999. The Applicant has made a representation for considering him for the post of Inspector on 1.11.2000. The above said representation is yet to be disposed of by the Respondents. ~~Having regard to the claim made~~

4. Having regard to the claim made by the Applicant, we dispose of this O.A. by directing the Respondent No.1 to dispose of the Representation of the Applicant made on 1.11.2000 by passing a speaking order within 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. The Applicant, ~~is~~ however will be at liberty to assail any order passed in pursuance of disposal of this representation.

5. The O.A. is disposed of on the above terms and direction. No Costs.

'Dasti'

S. Raju
(Shankar Raju)
Member (J)