

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA No.1290/2016

New Delhi, this the 06th day of April, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. P. K. Basu, Member (A)**

1. Gyan Prakash Dubey
Production Assistant
Aged about 55 years,
S/o Sh. Raj Kumar Dubey
R/o H. No.B-33, Rapti Nagar, Phase-IV,
Gorakhpur, UP 237013.
 2. Ratnesh Kumar Mishra
Production Assistant
Aged about 48 years,
S/o Sh. Narendra Mishra
R/o H. No.562, Krishna Nagar, P.V.T. Colony,
Basharatpur, Gorakhpur
UP 273004.
- Applicants.

(By Advocate : Shri M. K. Bhardwaj)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through its Secretary
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi 110 001.
 2. The Chief Executive Officer,
Prasar Bharti, PTI Building,
Parliament Street,
New Delhi 110 001.
 3. The Director General
AIR, Akashwani Bhawan,
Parliament Street
New Delhi 110 001.
 4. The Director General,
Doordarshan,
Doordarshan Bhawan,
Mandi House,
New Delhi 110 001.
- ... Respondents.

(By Advocate : Shri Rajeev Sharma)

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman :

The applicants were appointed as Production Assistants at DDK Gorakhpur on 31.08.2001 and 03.12.2003 respectively in the pay scale of Rs.5000-8000/-. Their initial appointment was on probation for a period of two years. In the year 2004, the pay scale of Production Assistant was revised to Rs.6500-10500 w.e.f. 01.01.1996. The benefit of the revised pay scale was extended to all the Production Assistants serving in different Kendras of Doordarshan all over India. However, some Production Assistants were granted the revised scale of Rs.6500-10500. Some of the Production Assistants who were denied the benefit of revised pay scale approached Jaipur, Patna and Jodhpur Benches of the Tribunal where, respective OAs were allowed with direction to grant the revised pay scales with arrears. The applicants are claiming similar benefit.

2. The applicants submitted their representations (Annexure A-5 & A-6 with the present OA). It is submitted that these representations have not been considered by the respondents, even though the reliefs granted in favour of similarly situated persons have been finally upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the judgments of the Tribunal have been implemented. The applicants have given instances of such orders passed by the Tribunal and upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

3. In view of the above, we deem it appropriate to dispose of this Application with direction to the respondents to consider the representations of the applicants, i.e., Annexure A-5 & A-6 on the basis of the judgments referred to in the OA, and pass appropriate orders within a period of eight weeks. In the event, the claim of the applicants is to be rejected, the same shall be by a speaking and reasoned order.

Needless to say that the applicants shall have the liberty to seek redressal, if so required.

(P. K. Basu)
Member (A)

(Permod Kohli)
Chairman

/pj/