

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

RA. No. 2440/97.

\*\*\*

R.A.No. 88 /97in  
O.A.No.29 /94.

Dt. of Decision : 20-11-97.

1. K. Thulasidas
2. M.Venkatachary
3. B.V.Ramana Murthy
5. P.T.Kuttikrishnan
6. P.C.Ramakrishnayya

.. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~.  
Applicants.

Vs

1. The Union of India rep.by  
the Secretary, Min.of Mines,  
Dept. of Mines, Shastri Bhavan  
New Delhi-1.
2. The Director General,  
GSI, 27, J.N.Road,  
Calcutta-16.
3. The Dy.Director General,  
Southern Region, GSI,  
Bandlaguda, Hyderabad-660.
4. The Dy.Director General  
Training Institute, GSI,  
Bandlaguda, Hyderabad-660.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the applicants : Mr.G.Gopala Rao

Counsel for the respondents : Mr.N.R.Devaraj, Sr.CGSC.

CORAM:

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

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

Jax

ORDER

ORAL ORDER (PER HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (JUDL.))

None for the applicants. Heard Mr.N.R.Devaraj,  
learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicants have filed this RA to review the order  
dt. 20-06-97 passed in OA.29/94. The said OA.29/94 came to be  
~~dismissed on merits and at that time the applicants remained absent.~~  
Heard the learned counsel for the respondents, perused the records  
and we gave the said order.

3. Now the applicants have filed this RA praying that they  
sought for declaration that they were eligible for the scale of pay  
recommended by the review committee of GSI as applicable to the posts  
of Superintendents and Assistants w.e.f., 20-12-80, that the  
recommendations of the committee in respect of the other categories  
Pay commission has conceded the grievances of the employees in the  
categories held by the applicants and has recommended sanction of  
higher scales of pay and that order may be reviewed.

4. The respondents had accepted the recommendations of the  
committee only with regard to certain other categories other than  
Superintendents and Assistants, working in the GSI. The acceptance or  
rejection of the recommendations of the committee ~~was~~ <sup>was left to the</sup> discretion of the GSI.

5. Hence this Tribunal cannot sit on the judgement if some  
recommendations of the review committee was rejected as <sup>it is a</sup> policy matter.

6. If the 5th Pay commission has recommended their cases it is  
for the Government to decide as they deem fit. Mere recommendations of  
their cases for better emoluments by the 5th Pay commission in no way  
give the right to the applicants to demand the acceptance of the review  
committee as a recommendation.

7. We find no merits in this RA.

8. Hence the RA is dismissed.

9. No costs.

  
(B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)  
MEMBER (JUDL.)

Dated : The 20th Nov. 1997.  
(Dictated in the Open Court)

  
(R. RANGARAJAN)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)