

(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,
Trimulghery, Secunderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.N.V.Raghava Reddy

CORAM:

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

J U D G E M E N T

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
Rs. 210-200
were was carrying the pay scale of Rs.200-250 in the Ministry of Defence
and as per the recommendations of the Expert Classification Committee
of this Commission 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

.. 2 ..

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 Application, No.72 to 80/95 and R.As were dismissed by this Tribunal. However against those RAs the respondents authorities have approached the ^{Hon'ble} Supreme Court by filing SLP NOs. 8777 to 8785/97 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} with the ^{Hon'ble} Supreme Court for ^{Hon'ble} a direction to follow the directions of the ^{Hon'ble} Supreme Court in the SLP referred to above has to be given ^{followed} in this case also.

5. The directions ^{Hon'ble} will hold good in this case also depending on the outcome of the SLP filed in the Supreme Court. If the ^{Hon'ble} 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.)

(18.9.97)

(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 18th September, 1997

(Dictated in Open Court)

sd

22/10/97

(A)

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

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

YLKR

II Court

