

(26)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.NO. 1467/94

Date of Order: 18.9.97

BETWEEN :

Abdul Majid

.. Applicant.

AND

1. Union of India, rep. by its
Secretary, Ministry of Defence,
Seva Bhavan, New Delhi-

2. The Commandant,
AOC Record Office,
Trimulgherry, Secunderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. N.V.Raghava Reddy

CORAM:

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

JUDGEMENT

1. Oral order as per Hon'ble Shri B.S. Jai Parameswar.

Mr. K. Sudhakara Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. N.V.Raghava Reddy, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant is working as a Tailor from 27.3.81 at Artillery Centre, Hyderabad. He is presently in the ^{scale} grade of pay of

He was carrying the pay scale of Rs. 200-250 in the Ministry of Defence and as per the recommendations of the Expert Classification Committee were sanctioned the increased pay scales to the workers of EME. Subsequently the Boot Makers and Tailors in the EME became eligible to the revised scales of pay of

3. He has relied upon the decision in O.A.443/88 of this Tribunal claiming the revised scales of pay of Rs.210-290 to Rs.260-400 with consequential benefits. The question of fixation of pay for the artisan staff like Boot Makers, Tailors, etc have been considered by this Tribunal and number of directions have been given. But those directions were challenged in (in OA Nos. 1524, 1525, 1150, 1530, 52, 1267, 1264, 1263 and 161/95) Review Applications No. 72 to 80/ and R.As were dismissed by this Tribunal. However against those RAs the respondents authorities have approached the Supreme Court by filing SLP Nos. 8777 to 8785/97 i.e. of 1996. R.As 72 to 80/ Those SLPs are still pending.

4. In view of the above, directions given by this Tribunal in similar cases which are still pending before the Supreme Court for ~~with the Supreme Court for~~ ~~and issue a direction to follow the directions~~ ~~of the Supreme Court in the SLP referred to above has to be given~~ ~~in this case also.~~

will hold good in this case also depending on the outcome of the SLP filed in the Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court withdraws the relief given by this Tribunal, the applicant also cannot be given such a relief. If the Supreme Court allows the relief given to the applicant similarly placed to the applicants then the applicant is also entitled.

6. With the above direction the OA is disposed of. No costs.

(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (Judl.)

(8.9.97)

(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn)

Dated: 18th September, 1997

(Dictated in Open Court)

sd

92/10/92

(A)

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

1 CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD

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

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR :

Dated: 18-9-97

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A/R.A/C.A.NO.

in

O.A.NO. 1467/94

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued

Allowed

Disposed of with ~~Directions~~

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default

Ordered/Rejected

YLR

II Court

