

(P)

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

M

(2)

ORDER

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
(A.K.Gaur)
Judicial Member

aa.

Dr.G.C.Srivastava
(Dr.G.C.Srivastava)
Vice Chairman