### CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE BENCH \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Commercial Complex(BDA) Indiranagar Bangalore - 560 038 Dated : 4 Sep 87

Application Nos.

1991, 1992, 1993, 2039 to 2043/86(F)

#### **Applicants**

Shri R. Durgaprasad & 7 Ors

#### Respondents

The Secy, M/o Finance(Dept of Expdt) V/s and 4 Ors

To

- Shri R. Durgaprasad D.O.S. L - II Central Excise, HQrs Office PB No. 5400, C.R. Blds Queens' Road Bangalore - 560 001
- Shri A.S. Venkata Ramaiah Dy Office Superintendent L-II CEX, HQrs Office, Central Excise C.R. Blds, Queens Road Bangalore - 560 001
- Shri H.S. Ananthapadmanabha Dy Office Supdt. L-II Central Excise, Lalbagh Division Bangalore - 560 025
- Shri B.R. Sridhara Dy Office Supdt. L-II HQrs Office, Central Excise Central Revenue Blds Queens' Road Bangalore - 560 001
- Shri P.K. Janardhana Rao Dy Office Supdt. L-II 5. CEX HQrs Office C.R. Buildings, Queens' Road Bangalore - 560,001

- Smt. B.M. Vinutha Dy Office Supdt. L-II Central Excise HQrs Office C.R. Blds, Queens' Road Bangalore - 560 001
- Shri E. Nagaraju Dy Office Supdt. L-II Central Excise HQrs Office C.R. Buildings, Queens' Rd Bangalore - 560 001
- Shri Doddarangappa Dy Office Supdt, L-II Central Excise HQrs Office C.R. Buildings, Queens' Rd Bangalore - 560 001
- 9. Shri M.S. Nagaraja Advocate 35 (Above Hotel Swagath) Ist Main, Gandhinagar Bangalore - 560 009
- 10. The Secretary Ministry of Finance (Dept. of Expenditure) North Block

RECEIVED (5 Copies Diary No. 1079 CR 8 Date: 81410 - B

- 11. The Chairman
   Central Board of Excise & Customs
   New Delhi 110 002
- 12. The Comptroller & Auditor General New Delhi
- 13. The Collector of Central Excise Central Revenue Buildings Queens' Road Bangalore - 560 001
- 14. The Assistant Collector of Central Excise Lalbagh Division Bangalore - 560 025
- 15. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao Central Govt. Stng Counsel High Court Buildings Bangalore - 560 001

\*\*\*\*\*\*

Sub ject : SENDING COPIES OF CRDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of CRDER passed by this Tribunal in the above said applications on 27-8-87

Encl : As above

Deputy Registrar (Judicial)

# BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 27th DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

Present : Hen'ble Justice Sri k.S. Puttaswamy Vice-chairman

Hon'ble Sri P.Srinivasan

Member (A)

Application Nos.1991/86(F) C/w -1992, 1993, 2039 to 2043 of 1986

1. R.Durgaprasad,

J.O.S. L-II Central Excise,

PB No.5400, Hors Office,

Queens Read, C.R.Bldg.,

Bancalere - 560 001. as in a

as in application No.1991/86.

2. A.S.Venkata Ramaiah,
Dy.Office Superintendent L.II,
CEX, Hors Office, CR Bldgs.,
Queens Road, Bangalere — 1. as in application No.1992/85.

3. H.S.Ananthapadmanabha,
Dy. O S L II, Central Excise,
Lalbagh Division,
Bangalore - 25. as in application No.1993/86.

4. E.A.Sridhara, DY.O S L II Hqrs Office, Central Excise, Queens Read, Bangalere - 1. as in Application No. 2039/85.

5. P.F.Janardhana Rae,
Dy.OS L II, Central Excise,
Hors Office, Ch Bldgs.,
Bangalere - 1. as in application No.2040/85.

6. B.M.Vinutha,
Dy.OS LII, Central Excise,
Hqrs Office, Dangalere — 1. as in application No.2041/85.

7. E.Nagaraju,
UDC, Under orders of promotion
on Dy.OS LII, Central Excise,
Hers Office, Bangalore. as in application No.2042/86.

8. Doddarangaspa, Dy.OS C II, Central Excise, Queens Read, Bangalers. as in application No.2043/85.

( DR.M.S.Nacaraj ... Advecate )

VS.

1. Union of India, by Secretary Ministry of Finance, (Dept.of Expdtr.), North Block, New Delhi.





- 2. Chairman, Central Beam of Excise & Custems, New Delhi.
- 3. Comptreller & Auditor General, GOI, New Delhi.
- 4. Callactor of Central Excise, Queen's Read, Bancelore 1.
- 5. Assistant Collector of Central Excise, Lalbagh Division, ... as in application No.1993/86. Bangalere 25.

( Sri M. Vasudeva Rae ... Advocate )

These applications have come up before the Tribunal today. Hen'ble Justice Sri k.S.Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman, made the fellowing:

## CRDER

As the questions that arise for determination in these cases are common, we propose to discuss of them by a common order.

- 2. Prior to and as on 1.1.1986 and wnwards all the applicants are working as Deputy Office Superintendents—Level II ('DOS II') in the Central Excise & Customs Department of Gavernment. Prior to 1.1.1985, their pay scale was s.425-700 and that of the Inspectors was s.425-800.
- The applicants claim parity with the Inspectors of the Dupartment on diverse factors.
- 4. Before the IJ Pay Commission presided ever by late Justice Singhal of the Supreme Court, the DCS II claiming parity with the Inspectors of the Dipt. urged the said Commission to recommend for extending them the

Department. But it appears that the IV Pay Commission with—
out specifically examing their said claims and making any
specific recommendations on the same, however recommended
to Government to revise pay scales of Inspectors from %.425—
800 to 1640—2900 and the pay scales of DOS II from %.425—700
to %.1400—2300. In its resolution dated 13.9.1986(Annexure 'A')
and the Central Civil Services(Revised) Pay Scales Rules of
1986, Government had accepted and had implemented them from
1.1.1986. Hence the applicants in these separate and identical applications made under Section 19 of the Administrative
Tribunals Act, 1985('Act') have sought for a direction to
the respondents to extend them the pay scale of %.1640—2900
as(are) is allewed to Inspectors of the Department from 1.1.1986.

- 5. In their common reply, the respondents have asserted that the enture of duties performed by the DOS II were not comparable to the Inspectors of the Department and therefore they were not entitled to higher pay scale of s.1540-2900 ellowed to Inspectors.
- o. Dr.M.S.Nagaraja, learned counsel for the applicants, contends that the nature of the duties performed by DCS II and Inspectors of the Department in all respects were one and the same and denial of higher scales allowed to Inspectors was discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution.
- 7. Sii M.Jasudava Rao, learned counsel for the respondents, contends that the nature of the duties performed by the DOS II and Inspectors were not one and the same and were totally different and therefore allowing higher scales to Inspectors

was not discriminatory and does not violate Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution.

- Before the IV Pay Commission, DOS II claimed parity with Inspectors and for extending them the pay scales allowed to Inspectors of the Dapt. But on the same there were no specific recommendations to Government which also did not examine their claim specifically and give a decision one way or the other.
- 9. In their applications and the very elaborate written brief filed before us today, the applicants have produced a mass of material justifying their claim for parity with the Inspectors. In para 9 (v) of the written brief the applicants had asserted thus:

"9(v) Successive pa/ commissions are slewly are slowly step-ty-step bringing the ministerial supervisory cadres to a less charming park, in the sense that they are not adequately remunarated. Only to high-light this, the chart is prepared in para 5-10 of the Application. In pure > (v) of their reply, the averment made by the Respondents, that it is natural that the scale of pay for the post of Inspectors will be improved with the passage of time, is not at all convincing, because, the Respondents have not put forth any reason for their such averment and at the same time, the Respondents have also not adduced any reason for not giving same treatment to ministerial supervisory officers. Also, the Respondents have not disclosed as to what sin the DOS (equivalent cadre) in the same department have committed and why such un-natural treatment to them. Applicants further request to consider the fellowing true resition:

Head Clerk	Inspector	Degree with
(New DLS L.II)	f C.Ex. (OG)	reference to
SCALE	SCALE	DOS L.II

I Pay Commission 1931	160-280	100 (Probn.) 120-200	Hicher
II Pay Commission 1959	210-380	210-380	Equal
III Pay Commission 1973	425-700	425-800	Lower Max.
TV Pay Commission 1986	1400-2300	1640-2900	Lewer Max.

		SG) reference to	3
<b>2</b> 50 <b>–3</b> 25	200-300	Higher	

I Pay Commission 1931	250-325	200-300	Higher .
II Pay Commission 1959	335–425	320-485	Higher Min. LowerMax.
III Pay Commission 1973	550-750	550-900	Lawer Max.
IV Pay Commission 1986		D SG CAURE 1640-2900	Lower even when compared with recruited Inspector.

In both the cases as shown in the above charts, for DOS L.II and DOS L.I, there was nothing adverse in the minimum basic start and annual increments till 1.1.86. Downward trend in the pay scales of the minimsterial superviously officers comparatively with Inspectors of the same department, (which supervisory officers were all along (for a period of 55 years) either equal or were in higher status) has now resulted in not only frustration but also humiliation to the applicants cadre within the department and for that matter even within the same office also."

We are not in a position to say whether all of the statments are correct or not. Even otherwise all these and other factors elaborately stated by the applicants in their original applications and written brief; undoubtedly call for a further consideration by Government in the first instance. In this view, we consider it proper to direct Government in the Finance Ministry to examine and decide the claim of the applicants by collecting all such information and material as is necessary to decide the questions.

10. For the above purpose, we consider it proper to allow the applicants to file their written representations before Government within a reasonable time. Or.Nagaraja seeks one month's time from this day to file the same beofore the Government. We are of the view that this rejuest of Dr.Nagaraja is reasonable. We also consider it proper to fix a reasonable time for the disposal of these representation by Government.



- 11. In the light of our above discussions we make the following orders:
  - 1. We permit the applicants to file their written representations on their claim before Government within a period of one month from this day.
  - 2. We direct Government of India in the Ministry of Finance to examine and dispose of written representation if any to be filed by the applicants within appried of six menths from the date such representations are filed before it.
  - 3. All questions are left open.
- 12. Applications are disposed of in the above tarms.

  But in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to tear their own costs.

Dence Barbin

Schlvice-charman and slak! member (A)

-True Copy-

an.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL DENCH

BANGALORE