

10

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application Nos. 1312/93, 201/94 and 202/94

Tribunal's order

Dated: 11.7.96

Heard Shri G.K. Masand, counsel for the applicant. Shri S.S. Karkera for Shri P.M. Pradhan counsel for the respondents.

2. The Tribunal vide order dated 11.4.96 directed the applicant to make suitable representation to the Competent Authority, who may consider their case on the basis of relief already granted to similarly placed employees by the respondents in O.A. No. 834/94 and 938/94 within a period of two weeks.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that instead of adhering to the directions of the Tribunal the respondents rejected the representation made by the applicants and stated that the matter is referred to the Ministry for clarification. The respondents are directed to file reply on or before 7.8.96.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant states that the respondents have discriminated the two categories, one category has been paid the Overtime Allowance and the other category has been paid less. There is a complete discrimination in the matter of Over Time allowance between the similarly placed employees. In this connection the concerned Senior Officer is directed to file an affidavit stating under what circumstances the

: 2 :

two categories has been discriminated.

The learned counsel for the applicant states that this application has been filed under Rule 24 of the CAT procedure Rules.

Adjourned to 7.8.96.

✓ 4/0 Copy of the order be given to the parties.

B.S. Hegde
(B.S. Hegde)
Member (J)

NS

22.11.1996
Order/Judgment remitted
to Appellate Court (s)
on 3.12.1996

(S)
27.8.1996