

(19)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

D.A. 1267/95.

Dt. of Decision : 20-10-95.

1. G. Pichayya
2. Ramasre
3. Naraiya Bhogal
4. P. Subramani
5. V. Govardhan
6. Smt. G. Sayamma
7. R. Krishna

.. Applicants.

Vs

1. Union of India, Rep.
by its Secretary,
Min. of Defence, Sena Bhavan,
New Delhi-11.
2. The Commanding Officer,
EME, DEPOT. BN.
Secunderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr. K. Sudhakar Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.R. Deverej, Sr. CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI : MEMBER (ADMN.)

O.A.NO.1267/95.

JUDGMENT

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHY, MEMBER (ADMN.))

Heard Shri K.Sudhakar Reddy, learned counsel for the applicants and Shri N.R.Devaraj, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. It is stated for the applicants that all of them are Boot Makers. This OA was filed praying for direction to the respondents to grant the benefit of the pay scale of Rs.260-400 of the Skilled Grade as per the judgment of the Apex Court in Prabhu Lal and another Vs. Union of India and others in WP(C) No.492 of 1991 dated 3.10.91 and to pay the arrears with effect from 16.10.1981.

3. The relief claimed in this OA is squarely covered by our order dated 15.9.95 in OA 1042/93. For the reasons stated therein, this OA is ordered as under:-

(i) The pay of the applicants has to be notionally fixed in the pay scale of Rs.260-400 as on 15.10.1984 and the monetary benefit has to be given with effect from 9.2.1988. But if ultimately R-1 is going to take a decision that the monetary benefit has to be given even earlier to 9.2.1988, these applicants also have to be given the monetary benefit accordingly.

(ii) R-1 has to take a decision by 31.3.1996 as to whether the benefit as per the Memo. No.17(5)/89-D(Civ.I), dated 19.3.1993 has to be extended even to the trades other than the five trades identified by the Expert Committee and the 11 trades identified by the Anomalies Committee ~~(The trades of these applicants are not in the 16 trades referred to above).~~

4. We make it clear that the applicants/such of the applicants who are Boot Makers alone are entitled to the above reliefs.

5. It is needless to say that if the applicants are aggrieved in regard to the ultimate decision of R-1, they are free to move this Tribunal under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

6. No costs. //

(A.B.GORTHI)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

(V.NEELADRI RAO)
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 20th October, 1995.
Open court dictation.

Deputy Registrar(J)CC

vsn

To

1. The Secretary, Min.of Defence,
Sena Bhavan, Union of India, New Delhi-11.
2. The Commanding Officer, EME, DEPOT, BN,
Secunderabad.
3. One copy to Mr.K.Sudhakar Reddy, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

~~THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN~~ : M(A)
AB Gorthi

DATED: 26-10-1995

~~ORDER~~/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 1267/95

T.A.No.

(W.P.No.)

Admitted and Interim directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed: *at the admission stage.*

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

along with 2 OA Copies

No Spare Copy

