CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH

I. O.A. No.060/01159/2014 **Decided on: 24.12.2014**

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

1. Gurnam Singh
2. Nikka Ram
3. Raghubir Singh
4. Suba Singh
5. Rashpal Singh II
6. Ajay Partap Singh
7. Malkiat Singh
8. Bhoomi Chand

All are presently working SRO, Chandigarh.

9. Sukhpal Singh
9-A. Surjit Singh

Presently working under SSP, Ropar.

10. Ashok Kumar
Presently working under SSP, Jalandhar.

11. Kamaljit Singh
Presently working under SSP, RMS 'LD' Division, Ludhiana.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.

2. The Postmaster General Punjab, Sector 17, Near Municipal Corporation Office, Chandigarh.

3. SSP, Ludhiana.

4. SSP, Ropar.

5. SSP, Jalandhar.

.....Respondents

II. <u>O.A. No. 060/01160/2014</u>

1. Mahesh Kumar
2. Jasbir Singh
3. Gurmeet Kaur

   Presently all are working Supdt. Post Offices Muffasil Division Ludhiana.

4. Kamaljit Singh
5. Sham Singh
6. Prem Singh
7. Ranjit Kapoor
8. Usha
9. Kiran Balan 1st
10. Ved Parkash
11. Joginder Singh II
12. Ajmer Singh
13. Naresh Kumar II
14. Om Parkash

15. Surinder Kumar II

All are working Sr. Supdt. RMS 'LD' Division Ludhiana.

16. Harpal Singh Bhandal (Retired on 31.05.2011)

Retired from the office of Sr. Supdt. Post Offices City Division, Ludhiana.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General Punjab, Sector 17, Near Municipal Corporation Office, Chandigarh.
3. SSP, Ludhiana.

.... Respondents

III.060/01161/2014

1. Lamber Pal
2. Pawitar Lal
3. Shukla Gupta
4. Kamla Devi
5. Amit Chaudhary
6. Anita Maini
7. Sushma Kumari
8. Jagtar Singh
9. Sudesh Kumari

10. Satnam Singh

11. Sunder Pal

All are working under SSP, Jalandhar

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.

2. The Postmaster General Punjab, Sector 17, Chandigarh.

3. SSP, Jalandhar City, Jalandhar.

.... Respondents

IV. <u>060/01162/2014</u>

1. Megh Nath
2. Mahesh Gandhi
3. Aradhna
4. Gian Parkash
5. Shamsher Singh
6. Harsh Bala
7. Reeta Sharma Bhardwaj
8. Mangal Singh
9. Jai Bhagwan
10. Rajwant Kaur
11. Rama Datt

12. UYpma Rani

13. Rama Rani

14. Namita Mehta

All are presently working SSP, Kurukshetra.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.

2. The Postmaster General Punjab, Ambala.

3. SSP, Kurukshetra.

.... Respondents

V. 063/00162/2014

1. Sushil Kumar

2. Pushpa Chauhan

3. Joginder Lal

4. Prem Ballabh

5. Yashodhra

6. Prem Chand

7. Nirmala Devi

8. Bhawani Prasad

9. Kusham lata Sharma

10. Bimla Kashyap

11. Sandhya
12. Poonam Sharma
13. Nathu Ram Chauhan
14. Laxmi Kant Kashyap
15. Thakur Dass
16. Anita chadha
17. Ashok Kumar Negi
18. Narinder Singh
19. Sohan Lal
20. Sunita Sharma
21. Anushil Sharma
22. Sita Ram
23. Sat Pal, SRO RMS Pathankot H.P.
24. Presently all are working, SSP, Shimla.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General, Shimla.
3. SSP, Shimla.

.... Respondents

VI. <u>060/01165/2014</u>

1. Sushila Kumari
2. Lajwanti

   Presently working under SSP, RMS G-Division, Nankpura, New Delhi – 21.
3. Gokul Chand
4. Vishan Lal
5. Shiv Ram
6. Shiv Dhari

   All are presently working under SSP, Faridabad.
7. Yashpal Singh Aswal

Presently working under SSP, Ambala.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General, Ambala.
3. SSP, Ambala
4. SSP, Faridabad

.... Respondents

VII. **060/01166/2014**

1. Gaje Singh
2. Kishan Singh
3. Bharat Ram
4. Daya Ram
5. Harish Chander
6. Sadhu Ram
7. Ramesh Kumar

8. Satyabir Singh Dahiya
9. Satbir Singh Morwal
10. Mrs. Hardevi P.A.

Presently all are working SSP, Bhiwani

11. Swatanter Kalra
12. Ved Parkash

Presently all are working SSP, Hissar.

.....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Post and Telegraph Dept, New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General, Ambala.
3. SSP, Bhiwani.
4. SSP, Hisar.

.... Respondents

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, proxy counsel for the applicants

Order (Oral)

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

1. The facts and law points involved in all these O.A. being similar, these are disposed of by a common order.
2. By way of the present O.A., the applicants have sought issuance of a direction to the respondents to grant them the pay and allowances at par with the regular Postal Assistant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants herein, who were appointed as Postal Assistant (Reserved Trained Pool) after having requisite training, have been paid lesser pay and allowance than the regular Postal Assistant despite they are discharging the equal work. In support of his claim, learned counsel has placed reliance upon a decision rendered in identical O.A. (NO. 788/HR/2001) titled **Pardeep Jain & Others Vs. U.O.I. & Others** which has been affirmed by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 18.02.2014 in CWP NO. 1466/CAT/2004. He further submits that the applicants have already preferred a representation dated 30.05.2014 (Annexure A-1) seeking the claim aforementioned but the same has not been decided till date. He makes a statement at the Bar that the applicants would be satisfied if the O.A. is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider their representation and take a view thereon in accordance with law, within a reasonable period.

4. Considering that the applicant is simply asking for a direction to the respondents to decide her pending representation, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents and call for their reply. Also no prejudice shall be caused to the respondents due to non-issuance of notice as they have not yet decided the representation

of the applicant which they are supposed to do within a period of six months as per Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.

5. Accordingly, the O.A. is disposed of, with a direction to the respondents to consider the representation dated 30.05.2014 (Annexure A-1) in accordance with Law, by passing a speaking and reasoned order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. While deciding the representation of the applicants, the fact and effect of the orders passed by this Tribunal in the case of Pardeep Jain(supra) shall also be taken into account.
6. Needless to say that we have not commented on the merits of the case.
7. No costs.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 24.12.2014

'mw'

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH CHANDIGARH

10.MA 060/00019/15 in

O.A. No. 060/01159/14

Gurnam Singh & Others Vs. U.O.I. & Others

09.01.2015

Present: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, proxy counsel for the applicants

1. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that in the Memo of Parties, Respondents No. 3 to 5 have inadvertently been mentioned as SSP, Ludhiana, SSP, Ropar and SSP, Jalandhar and pray that these may kindly be read as Senior Superintendent Post Office Ludhiana, Senior Superintendent Post Office, Chandigarh and Superintendent RMS L Division, Ludhiana.
2. For the reasons given in the MA and in the interests of justice, MA is allowed. Amended Memo of Parties is taken on record. The O.A. was disposed of on 24.12.2014. Registry is directed to issue copy of the order dated 24.12.2014 to the respondents mentioned in the amended Memo of Parties.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

'mw'