

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORDERS OF THE BENCH

Date of Order: 04.07.2013

OA No. 470/2013

Mr. Amit Mathur, counsel for applicant.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

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


(S.K. KAUSHIK)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

Kumawat

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 470/2013

DATE OF ORDER: 04.07.2013

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. S.K. KAUSHIK, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Dr. Ajit Gupta S/o Late Shri Dhanendra Gupta, aged 67 years, R/o 101, Pearl Passion, Goverdhan, B-78 Rajendra Marg, Bapu Nagar, Jaipur.

...Applicant

Mr. Amit Mathur, counsel for applicant.

VERSUS

1. The Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Science and Agriculture, New Delhi.
2. The Indian Council of Agriculture Research, through its Director General, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.

...Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

By way of present Original Application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has sought for the following reliefs: -

- "(i), the present original application may kindly be allowed and directions may be issued to the respondents to grant two advance increments to the applicant w.e.f. 27.07.1998. The respondents may be further directed to give all consequential benefits accordingly along with the interest @ 12% per annum;
- (ii). Any other order or direction which deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the applicant.
- (iii). Cost of this original application also may be awarded in favour of the applicant."

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the applicant made a statement at the bar that the applicant will be satisfied if a direction is given to the respondents to decide his pending representation dated 30th May, 2011 within some stipulated time.

3. The order which I proposed to pass there is no need to issue notice to the respondents and call for counter affidavit as the applicant himself is seeking direction to decide his pending representation.

4. In the aforementioned background, I am of the considered view that it will met the end of justice to direct the respondent No. 2 to take a final decision upon the pending representation of the applicant dated 30th May, 2011 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order by passing a detailed, reasoned and speaking order in accordance with the provision of law.

5. If any prejudicial order against the interest of the applicant is passed by the respondents, the applicant will be at liberty to challenge the same by way of filing the substantive Original Application in accordance with the provision of law.

6. In terms of the above, the Original Application is disposed of in limine. It goes without saying that I have not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case. No order as to costs.


(S.K. KAUSHIK)
JUDICIAL MEMBER