

24-5-2011

(26)

OA. 204/2007

Mr. S.S. Ola proxy for

Mr. P.V. Calla Ad. counsel for petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Sharma Ad. counsel for respondents

Heard Ad. counsel for parties,

The OA stands disposed of by a  
separate order.

Anil Kumar  
(Anil Kumar)  
Member(IA),

L.S. Rathore  
(Justice S. Rathore)  
Member(J),

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
JAIPUR BENCH

Jaipur, this the 24<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011

**Original Application No.204/2007**

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.RATHORE, MEMBER (JUDL.)  
HON'BLE MR. ANIL KUMAR, MEMBER (ADMV.)**

Jose Thomas  
s/o Shri Thomas Joseph,  
at present working on the post of  
Laboratory Technician,  
O/o G.C.-1, Central Reserve Police Force,  
Group Centre, Golf Course Road,  
Ajmer.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate,: Shri S.S.Ola, proxy counsel for Shri P.V.Calla)

Versus

1. The Union of India  
through Secretary to Home Affairs,  
New Delhi.
2. The Inspector General  
of Central Reserve Police Force,  
Northern Sector,  
R.K.Puram,  
New Delhi.
3. The Director/Inspector General of Police  
(Medical), Medical Directorate General,  
Old SPG Dispensary Block,  
Sector-4, Pushap Vihar,  
M.B.Road, New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Tej Prakash Sharma)

O R D E R (ORAL)

The short controversy involved in this case is with regard to grant of second ACP. The applicant claims that he has completed 24 years of regular service but the second ACP has been denied vide order dated 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 (Ann.A/1) on the ground that his last 5 years ACRs were not upto the mark. The applicant also filed a detailed representation before the respondents vide Ann.A/7 dated 19.4.2006, which is pending consideration.

2. Without entering into merit of the case, we deem it proper to direct the respondents to consider representation Ann.A/7 on its merit and shall pass speaking order having considered the circular issued from time to time with regard to grant of second ACP as the applicant has completed 24 years of service, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order

3. The applicant is at liberty to file fresh OA if any prejudicial order is passed against him.

4. With these observations, the OA stands disposed of with no order as to costs.

*Anil Kumar*

(ANIL KUMAR)  
Admv. Member

*12. S. Rathore*

(JUSTICE K.S.RATHORE)  
Judl. Member

R/