

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR  
BENCH, JAIPUR.

O.A. No. 534/93  
McB No.

Dt. or order: 16.9. '93

Ajay Kumar Sharma : Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Ors. : Respondents

Mr. J. K. Kaushik : Counsel for applicant

CORAM

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. L. Mehta, Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. O. P. Sharma, Member (Adm.)

PER HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D. L. MEHTA, VICE CHAIRMAN.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and we have perused the judgment dated 13.5.93. It is expected from the respondents that they should comply <sup>with</sup> the order dated 13.5.93 particularly when directions have been given that in order to avoid multiplicity of litigation the respondents are directed to give similar benefits to similarly placed employees, who have not approached the Tribunal. In such circumstances, it is the duty of the respondents to allow the benefits to similarly situated persons if the present applicant stands on the same footing though he has not approached the Tribunal earlier. In case the respondents do not allow such benefits to the similarly situated persons, ordinarily O.A. does not lie, the Contempt Petition lies. Applicant can move a Contempt Petition if he so chooses. We also observe that it is the duty of the respondents to decide the representation made by the applicant within a period of fortnight from the date of the receipt of a copy of this order and in case the representation is not decided, the applicant will be at liberty to move

A 1  
2

this Tribunal again according to law. A copy of this order alongwith the extra set of the O.A. already submitted, may be sent to the respondents. The O.A. stands disposed of.

(O.P.Sharma)  
Member (A)

(D.L.Mehta)  
Vice Chairman.