

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. No. 060/00358/2014

Decided on: 28.04.2014

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

Pappi son of Sh. Mohinder Singh, working as Labourer, NS NIS, Sports Authority of India (SAI), Moti Bagh, Patiala.

**.....Applicant
Versus**

1. Sports Authority of India, Jawahar Lal Nehru Stadium, East Gate, Lodhi Road Complex, New Delhi through its Director General.
2. The Executive Director, Sports Authority of India, Netaji Subhash Institute of Sports, Moti Bagh, Patiala.
3. The Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievance & Pension, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi.

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Pandit, counsel for the applicant
Mr. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for Respondents No. 1 & 2

Order (oral)

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

1. The present O.A. has been filed seeking mainly the following reliefs:-

"(i) That the action of the respondents in denying the benefit of Annexures A-1 and A-2 to the applicant be declared as wholly illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory and the respondents be directed to extend the benefit of revised pay scale of Rs.4400-7440+ Grade Pay of Rs.1300/- and 1800/- respectively, as the case may be, from 01.01.2006 and to release the arrears to the applicant without any further delay.

1
L

(ii) That applicant be also held entitled for the interest from the date the benefit of Annexure A-2 has been extended to the regular/temporary employees working with the respondents and from the date arrears have been paid to him"

2. On commencement of hearing, learned counsel for the applicant submits that a similar O.A. (No. 171/PB/2010) filed by the similarly placed employees titled Jarnail Singh and Others Vs. SAI & Others has been allowed by this Tribunal, vide order dated 01.09.2011. He submits that the applicant has preferred a representation dated 13.02.2014 (Annexure A-10) for the grant of the relevant benefits being similarly placed and that he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to consider his case in the light of decision in the case of Jarnail Singh (supra).

3. For the order we propose to pass in this case, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents. However, Mr. Arvind Moudgil, learned counsel, who is having advance notice, appears on behalf of Respondents No. 1 and 2. He does not object to disposal of the case in the manner requested by the learned counsel for the applicant. He submits that the respondents may be given a chance to consider and decide the representation of the applicant and while deciding it, they will look into the fact and

effect of the orders passed in the case of Jarnail Singh (supra).

4. Accordingly, on a consensual arrangement between the parties, we, without going into the merits of the case, dispose of the O.A, with a direction to the Competent Authority amongst the respondents to consider and take a view on the representation (Annexure A-10). If the applicant is found to be similarly situated to those in the case of Jarnail Singh, the relevant benefits be granted to him.


(RAJWANT SANDHU)
MEMBER (A)


(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 28.04.2014

'mw'