

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORDERS OF THE BENCH

Date of Order: 19.03.2013

OA No. 249/2013

Mr. Nand Kishore, counsel for applicant.

Heard. O.A. is disposed of by a separate order on the separate sheets for the reasons recorded therein.

Anil Kumar
(ANIL KUMAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Kumawat

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 249/2013

DATE OF ORDER: 19.03.2013

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. ANIL KUMAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Sunita Jangid W/o Anand Jangid, aged about 37 years, working as Senior Goods Clerk at Monitoring Cell, DRM Office, NWR Railway, Jaipur, R/o 300, Ranisati Nagar, Ajmer Road, Jaipur.

...Applicant
Mr. Nand Kishore, counsel for applicant.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through General Manager, North Western Railway, Jawahar Circle, Jagatpura, Jaipur.
2. Divisional Railway Manager, North Western Railway, Power House Road, Jaipur.
3. Mr. Mahesh Singh Naruka, Chief Booking Clerk, Under Training for CMI's Post C/o Sr. DCM, North Western Railway, Power House Road, Jaipur.

...Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

By way of filing the present Original Application, the applicant has prayed for the following reliefs:

1. Impugned letter dated 3rd December, 2012 may be declared arbitrary, bad in law and the same is required to be corrected vide which the name of the Respondent No. 3 was wrongly placed on the panel (Annexure A/1).
2. Impugned letter dated 24th January 2013 (Annexure A/2) may be declared arbitrary, bad in law and may be quashed and set aside.
3. They may be further directed to include the name of applicant in the panel deleting the name of Respondent No. 3 since Respondent No. 3 have joined the equivalent grade and exercised his option for the post of CGC.
4. Any other direction and orders, which are deemed proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may kindly be allowed to the applicant.

Anil Kumar

5. Cost of the O.A. may kindly be allowed to the applicant."
2. From bare perusal of the pleadings as well as documents available on record, it reveals that the applicant has submitted a detailed representation dated 07th February, 2013 (Annexure A/9) before the respondents, which is still pending for consideration. In view of this fact, I deem it just and proper that the ends of justice would be met if the official respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation dated 07th February, 2013 (Annexure A/9) by way of passing a reasoned and speaking order.
3. Consequently, the official respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation of the applicant dated 07th February, 2013 (Annexure A/9) strictly in accordance with the provision of law and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order expeditiously but in any case not later than a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
4. If any prejudicial order against the interest of the applicant is passed by the respondents, the applicant will be at liberty to agitate the matter before the appropriate authority.
5. With these observations and directions, the Original Application stands disposed of with no order as to costs.

Anil Kumar
(ANIL KUMAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER