

D

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JABALPUR BENCH

CIRCUIT SITTING AT BILASPUR

OA No.329/06

Bilaspur, this the 29th day of June 2006.

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr.G.C.Srivastava, Vice Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr.A.K.Gaur, Judicial Member

K.P.Jaiswal  
S/o Shri B.P.D.Jaiswal  
Head Clerk  
Under OHE Department  
S.E.C.Railway  
Pendra (CG)

Applicant

(By advocate Shri B.P.Rao)

Versus

- ✓
1. Union of India through  
The General Manager  
South Eastern Central Railway  
G.M.Office, Bilaspur.
  2. The Dy.Chief Personnel Officer (IR)  
South Eastern Central Railway  
Tehsil & District Bilaspur.
  3. The Divisional Railway Manager  
South East Central Railway  
Tehsil & District. Bilaspur.
  4. The Sr.Divisional Personnel Officer  
South East Central Railway  
Bilaspur.
  5. The Sr.Divisional Electrical Engineer(TRD)  
South East Central Railway  
Bilaspur Division, Bilaspur.
  6. Shri P.K.Dixit  
S/o not known  
Office Superintendent-II  
S.E.C. Railway  
O/o Assistant Divisional Engineer  
Umariya.  
Dist.Shahdol (MP)
- Respondents.

(By advocate

H ✓

O R D E R

By A.K.Gaur, Judicial Member


The applicant submitted a representation dated 28.9.2004 requesting for the grant of restructuring benefit for promotion to the post of OS-II in the scale of Rs.5500-9000 and the said representation was considered by the Railway Administration and by ~~letter~~ dated 25.11.04 the competent authority has passed an order, the concluding paragraph of which reads as under:

"As he requested for absorption in Engg. Deptt. under ADEN/PND is not acceptable. He cannot compare the seniority with the seniority in other cadre. Therefore, he has to continue in Elect. Deptt. only and progress further in the same Deptt."

2. On the same date, a representation was made by the Union to the competent authority and the same was decided on 10.2.06 and in this order, it has been specifically mentioned that the case has already been examined in terms of extant rules and further review indicates no scope to re-open the same. Hence the item may please be treated as closed.

3. We have also considered the same and we are of the considered opinion that the case has already been disposed of by the competent authority as far back as on 25.11.2004 and the matter has become time barred.

4. In view of the delay, we do not find any need to interfere in the matter. Hence the OA is dismissed. No costs.

  
(A.K.Gaur)  
Judicial Member

  
(Dr.G.C.Srivastava)  
Vice Chairman

aa.