

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. No.060/00377/2014

Decided on: 30.04.2014

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mrs. Rajwant Sandhu, Member (A)**

1. MES No. 372424 Gopal Krishan, Elect. SK c/o GE(S) Ambala Cantt.
2. MES No. 372128 Jai Pal Singh, Elect. C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
3. MES No. 372205 Omkar Singh, FGM C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
4. MES NO. 372130 Anil Kumar, Elect, C/o GE(N) Ambala Cantt.
5. MES NO. 372999 Harminder Singh, Carpt. C/o GE(N) Ambala Cantt.
6. MES No. 372134 Maan Singh, Carpenter, C/o GE(S) Ambala Cantt.
7. MES No. 372132 Naib Ram, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
8. MES NO. 372199 Jai Singh, FGM, C/o GE (U) Ambala Cantt.
9. MES NO. 372206 Raja Ram, FGM, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
10. MES No. 372202 Jaswant Singh, FGM, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
11. MES NO. 372201 Krishan Kumar, FGM, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
12. MES No. 372210 Sada Ram, FGM, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
13. MES NO. 372207 Bhag Singh, FGM, C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.
14. MES No. 372208 Narinder Singh, FGM C/o GE(U) Ambala Cantt.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Army HQ, New Delhi.
2. The Engineer in Chief, Army HQ, New Delhi.
3. The Chief Engineer, Western Command, Chandimandir.
4. Commander Works Engineer, Ambala Cantt.
5. Garrison Engineer (S), Ambala Cantt.
6. Garrison Engineer (N) Ambala Cantt.

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Shailendra Sharma, counsel for the applicants

Order (oral)

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

1. Heard.
2. Admittedly, no order rejecting the claim of the applicants has been passed so far by the respondents. However, learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have preferred a number of representations to the respondents but none has been replied till date and one of such representation dated 23.09.2013 is annexed as Annexure A-2 herein. He makes a statement at the Bar that the O.A. may be disposed of, with a direction to the respondents to consider and take a view on the representation (Annexure A-2) in accordance with law

and in the light of the orders dated 19.12.2013 passed by this Tribunal in O.A. NO. 842/PB/2012 whereby a similar issue has been put to rest.

3. In view of the limited prayer of the learned counsel for the applicants, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents and call for their reply.
4. The O.A. stands disposed of, without going into the merits of the case, with a direction to the respondents to consider and take a view on the representation (Annexure A-2) in accordance with law, within a period of two months. While deciding the representation, the respondents shall also look into the orders passed in O.A. No. 842/PB/2012. Needless to say, if the applicants are found to be similarly situated, their entitlement shall be given to them.
5. No costs.

Rs —
(RAJWANT SANDHU)
MEMBER (A)

Rs
(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 30.04.2014.

'mw'