

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1245/93

DATE OF ORDER : 11-12-1996.

Between :-

1. J.Jagadishwar Reddy
2. B.Anantha Reddy
3. S.Krishna Reddy
4. U.Hanumanthacharya

... Applicants

And

1. The Director General of Electrical Mechanical Engineers, Army Head Quarters, New Delhi.
2. The Commandant, I E.M.E. Centre, Secunderabad-7.
3. The Union of India, Ministry of Defence, represented by its Secretary to Government of India, New Delhi.

... Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri T.Suryakaren Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.R.Devaraj, Sr.CGSC

-- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A) )

-- -- --

There are 4 applicants in this OA . They are working as Jr.Civilian Technical Training Instructors in I.E.M.E, Centre Secunderabad under the control of Respondent No.2 in the scale

R

... 2.

of pay of Rs.1200-2040. Their promotional post is Senior Civilian Technical Training Instructor in the scale of pay of Rs.1400-2300. They prayed in this O.A. for merging both the grades and granting them the scale of Rs.1400-2300. Their main contention is that both the Senior and ~~Junior~~ Civilian Technical Training Instructors are performing the same duties and hence the ~~very~~ difference in classification is not warranted and they should be brought under the same designation i.e. the Senior Technical Training Instructor. The second contention is that both the Junior and Senior TTIs were appointed more or less having similar qualifications. Age wise also they are hence it may not be possible for the Jr. similarly placed Civilian Technical Training Instructor get promoted as Sr.Civilian TTIs as the incumbents in the Sr.Civilian TTIs also ~~at the same time~~ retire~~s~~ as the applicants herein. As the cadre is small, ~~one~~ comprising of 10 members each, there may not be difficulty in merging the cadres.

2. The case ~~was~~ heard for some time yesterday. Shri NR Devaraj, ~~the Case~~ also pleaded ~~for reduction of the scale~~. When this case was taken up today for further hearing, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that a representation has been filed to the 5th Pay ~~Commission~~ Revision Committee through the Union for amalgamating both the cadres and for grant of Rs.1400-2300 scale. Hence he submitted that he will file a fresh OA if their request is not considered by the 5th Pay Revision Commission, ~~and recommended~~.

3. In view of what is stated above, the O.A. is disposed-of



....3.

*inpt*  
as not pressed but liberty to file a fresh O.A. for the same  
relief if necessary after publication of the 5th Pay Revision  
Commission Report.

4. The Original Application is ordered accordingly. No  
order as to costs.

*B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR*  
(B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)  
Member (J)

*R.RANGARAJAN*  
(R.RANGARAJAN)  
Member (A)

*11/12/96*  
Dated: 11th December, 1996.  
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/

*16-12-96*  
D.R. (J)

3/1/97

TYPED BY  
COMPARED BYCHECKED BY  
APPROVED BYTHE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN: M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR:  
M(J)DATED: 11/12/96ORDER/JUDGEMENT

R.A./C.P/M.A. No.

D.A. NO. 1245/93 <sup>in</sup>ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED  
ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED 

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS.

II COURT

YLKR

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकारी  
Central Administrative Tribunals  
प्रेषण/DESPATCH

61 JAN 1997

हैदराबाद बैठकी  
HYDERABAD BENCH