

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR
ORDER SHEET**

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

17.11.2014

OA No. 291/00613/2014

Mr. C.B. Sharma, Counsel for applicants.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant.

The applicants have filed the present OA praying that the co-workers of the applicants were similarly situated and are getting grade pay of Rs.5400/- whereas the applicants in the present OA have been allowed the grade pay of Rs.4800/- only. The co-workers of the applicants had approached the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, Madras for granting the grade pay of Rs.5400/- instead of Rs.4800/- and the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, Madras allowed the OA. This order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, Madras was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court vide order dated 19.03.2014 (Annexure A/4). The SLP preferred against the order of the Hon'ble Madras High Court was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide order dated 19.08.2014 (Annexure A/8). The respondent no. 2, Comptroller & Auditor General of India, New Delhi has implemented the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, Madras.

The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicants in the present OA are similarly situated and, therefore, they are also entitled to get the grade pay of Rs.5400/- at par with their juniors i.e. Senior Auditors. That the applicants have filed a representations dated 18.09.2014 to respondent no. 2 i.e. Comptroller & Auditor General of India, New Delhi. These representations have been filed individually by the applicants.

In the interest of justice, respondent no. 2 is directed to consider and decide the representations of the applicants in accordance with the provisions of law by passing a reasoned & speaking order expeditiously but in any case not later than a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The learned counsel for the applicant is also directed to provide a copy of the paper book of this OA to respondent no. 2 alongwith a copy of this order. It is made clear that if the applicants are aggrieved by the decision taken by respondent no. 2 on their representation, they are at liberty to file fresh OA, if so advised. *Anil Kumar*

With these directions, the OA is disposed of with no order as to costs.

Anil Kumar
(Anil Kumar)
Member (A)

Abdul