

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH

NO. 39 / 97

Sr. B.N. Roy Applicant(s)

-Versus-

Union of India & ors Respondent(s)

Mr. S.C. Datta, B. Chakrabarti, A.K. Barua Advocates for Applicant(s)

Mr. B.K. Sanyal, R.C. Advocates for Respondent(s)

Office Notes Date Court's Order

This application is in
form and dated 11.3.97

C. A. No. 307

deposited vide

IPO No. 702934

Dated 25.2.97

4.3.97

Issue notice on the respondents to show cause as to why this application should not be admitted and reliefs prayed should not be granted. Returnable by six weeks.

List on 8.4.1997 for show cause and admission.

Annexure III page
11 and 12 not legible.

M 26/2

12-3-97

1/ Record received from
Court on 12-3-97

pg

M 11/3

8.4.97

2/ Requisite filed on 4-3-97

3/ Notice prepared and sent
to Despatch Section

In this application the applicant has challenged the Annexure-VI order dated 22.5.96 whereby the applicant was reverted from the post of Cabin Man Grade I to Cabin Grade II. The applicant was holding the post of Cabin Man Grade II and by order dated 25.4.90 he was promoted to Cabin Man Grade I and he was holding the said post for the next six years. In the meantime his scale of pay was revised as per the revision of pay. He was getting the scale of pay of Rs.1200-1800/- with effect from 1.3.1993. By Annexure-VI order dated 22.5.96 he was reverted

contd...

Notice Issued to The Respondent.
No- 1 to 4 by Registered post with
A/d. vide Despatch No- 745 to
748 Dt- 12-3-97.

M 19-3

Notice duly served
on R. No- 2.

1) Show cause has not been filed.

M 7/4


8.4.97 to the original post of Cabin Man Grade II and this was done without giving any opportunity of hearing. Being aggrieved the applicant submitted a representation (Annexure-VII) dated 7.6.96 to the Divisional Railway Manager (Personnel) through the Chief Yard Master contending inter alia that the reversion was not justified and also prayed that he might be put back to the post of Cabin Man Grade-I. The said representation is still pending. As the representation was not disposed of the applicant ^{has} filed the present application.

Notice on the second respondent was duly served. Notices are also deemed to be served on respondents No. 1, 3 & 4, as the notices were sent by registered post. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.

We have heard Mr S.C. Dutta Roy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant. The applicant submitted representation to the third respondent. When a representation was filed ~~xxxx~~ it was a duty of the respondents, more specifically the third respondent to dispose of the representation. However, this was not done even after the expiry of six months. Therefore, we dispose of this application with a direction to the third respondent to dispose of Annexure-VII representation dated 7.6.1996 as early as possible ^{at any rate} within a period of 1 (one) month from the date of receipt ~~xxxx~~ of this order.

Original Application is disposed of.


Member


Vice-Chairman

24.4.97
copy of the order
has been sent to the
D/section for issuing
the same to the
panels.

sh
24/4

Issued vide no
1478 to 1482 of
30.4.97

sh
7/5