

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. No.060/00810/2014 Decided on: 15.09.2014

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)**

1. Anita Kumari
2. Kiran Bala
3. Prem Lata
4. Daisy Rani
5. Navjot Kaur
6. Amanvir Kaur
7. Anita Kumari

All working as Assistant Nursing Superintendent in Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Nirman Bhawan, new Delhi.
2. Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration through Advisor to Administrator, U.T. Civil Secretariat, Sector 9 Chandigarh.
3. Secretary, Medical Education and Research, Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration, U.T. Civil Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh.
4. Director Principal, Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh.
5. State of Punjab through Chief Secretary to Government of Punjab, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. R.K. Sharma, counsel for the applicants

Order (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member(J)

1. By way of the present O.A., the applicants have sought issuance of a direction to the respondents to consider the anomaly in their pay scale viz-a-viz lower post of Staff Nurse, Nursing Sister and to grant them the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs. 5400/-(G.P.) with all the consequential benefits. They have sought a further direction to the respondents to remove the discrepancy in the mentioning of the complete designation in the notification of the pay scales.
2. In support of their claim, learned counsel for the applicants submits that earlier also there was an anomaly in their pay scale which was rectified by the respondents. However, subsequently in the revised pay scale, the applicants who were discharging higher responsibilities have been placed in the lesser grade pay against which they represented to the respondents on 22.07.2013 (Annexure A-9). The respondents have, however, not taken a view on the aforesaid representation. Learned counsel makes a statement at the Bar that the applicants would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to take a view on their representation in accordance with law, within a stipulated period.
3. Considering that the applicants are simply asking for a direction to decide their representation, there is no need to issue notice to the

respondents and call for their reply. Moreover, no prejudice would be caused to the respondents by non-issuance of notice as they have not yet taken a view on the representation which they are, otherwise, bound to take as per the Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunals Act.

4. In view of the above, we dispose of the O.A., without going into the merits of the case, with a direction to the Competent Authority amongst the respondents to consider the representation (Annexure A-9) and take a view thereon in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. A copy of the order so passed shall be communicated to the applicants.
5. No costs.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 15.09.2014

'mw'