

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

Original Application No: 833/93

Date of Decision: 3.8.1999

S.A.Juvekar

Applicant.

Advocate for
Applicant.

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

Respondent(s)

Mr.R.K.Shetty.

Advocate for
Respondent(s)

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri. Justice R.G.Vaidyanatha, Vice-Chairman,

Hon'ble Shri. B.N.Bahadur, Member(A).

(1) To be referred to the Reporter or not? *W*

(2) Whether it needs to be circulated to *W*
other Benches of the Tribunal?

R.G.Vaidyanatha
(R.G.VAIDYANATHA)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.833/93.

Tuesday, this the 3rd day of August, 1999.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri Justice R.G.Vaidyanatha, Vice-Chairman,
Hon'ble Shri B.N.Bahadur, Member(A),

S.A.Juvekar,
14,Ashirvad,
Swanand Nagar,
Kalatalav,Kalyan,
District Thane - 421 301.

...Applicant.

Vs.

1. Union of India,
through the Director General,
Joint Secretary,
Employment and Training,
Ministry of Labour,
Government of India, D.G.E & T,
Shramshakti Bhavan,
Rafi Marg,
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Regional Director,
Apprentice Training,
Regional Directorate of
Apprentices Training (Western
Region), Sion,
Bombay - 400 022.

...Respondents.

(By Advocate Mr.R.K.Shetty)

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

(Per Shri Justice R.G.Vaidyanatha, Vice-Chairman)

The case is called out for final hearing. The applicant and his counsel absent. Mr.R.K.Shetty, the learned counsel appears on behalf of the respondents.

This is an old case of 1993. The applicant's grievance is two fold, one is about getting the benefits of IVth Pay Commission Report and the other is about seniority. In the amended written statement, the respondents have fairly stated that the applicant has been given all benefits on the basis of

the IVth Pay Commission Report and he has even been appointed as Training Officer w.e.f. 1.1.1986. To day, the respondents counsel brought to our notice an order dt. 20.8.1998 under which the applicant has been promoted further as Assistant Director of Training. In the circumstances, we ~~do not~~ find that substantial demands of the applicant have been met by the respondents.

2. However, in the circumstances of the case, the application is dismissed for non-prosecution. No order as to costs.

B.N.Bahadur

(B.N.BAHADUR)

MEMBER(A)

R.G.Vaidyanatha

(R.G.VAIDYANATHA)

VICE-CHAIRMAN

B.