

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. NO.060/00119/2014 Decided on: 13.02.2014

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

Pawan Kumar S/o Rulda Ram r/o village Soonda District Ambala,
Haryana.

.....Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi.
2. Deputy Commissioner cum President, District Red Cross Society, Ambala.
3. Secretary, Distt. Red Cross Society, Ambala.
4. Suman W/o Late Sh. Ramesh Chand r/o H. No. 139, Hira Nagar, Ambala City.
5. Manju Verma w/o Late Sh. Parshotam Verma r/o Village Sonia Colony, Amabla City.

.....Respondents

Present: Ms. Sangita Dhanda, counsel for the applicant
Mr. M.S. Sandhu, counsel for Respondents No. 2 & 3

Order (Oral)

BY HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER(J)

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant.
2. By way of the present O.A., the applicant has sought issuance of a direction to the respondents to regularize his services w.e.f. the date his juniors have been regularized.

3. In support of the above, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been working on the post of peon with the District Red Cross Society for the last 22 years. He submits that since the services of his juniors namely ms. Manju Verma and Ms. Suman have been regularized w.e.f. the year 2007 and 2008 respectively, therefore, he is also entitled to the same benefits. He submits that the applicant has approached the respondents for redressal of his grievance, vide various representations (Annexures A-6, A-7 and A-10) but the same have not been decided till date. Learned counsel has drawn our attention to a letter dated 03.10.2013 (Annexure A-9) to submit that the case of the applicant was ordered to be put up before the Executive Committee.
4. Learned counsel makes a statement at the Bar that the applicant would be content if a time-bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide his pending representations.
5. In view of the limited prayer made on behalf of the applicant, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents. However, Mr. M.S. Sandhu, learned counsel, who is having advance notice, appears. He does not object to the disposal of the case in the requested manner.

6. Accordingly, the O.A. stands disposed of, with a direction to Respondent No. 2 to take a final decision on the pending representations of the applicant within a period of two months.
7. Needless to say, we have not commented upon the merits of the case.
8. No costs.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 13.02.2014

'mw'