

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

**O.A No.1034/2012**

New Delhi this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. V. N. Gaur, Member (A)**

J. R. Dhiman, S/o. Raghbir Chand,  
R/o. 105/4, Thomsons Road,  
Railway Colony, New Delhi-2

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Yogesh Sharma)

Versus

1. Union of India, through the General Manager,  
Northern Railway, Baroda House,  
New Delhi.

2. The General Manager (P),  
Northern Railway, Baroda House,  
New Delhi.

3. Divisional Railway Manager,  
Northern Railway, State Entry Road,  
New Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. Shailendra Tiwary)

**O R D E R (O R A L)**

**Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J) :**

The applicant, Shri. J. R. Dhiman, has preferred the instant Original Application (O.A), to challenge the impugned order dated 01.07.2011 and for direction to the respondents to treat the periods mentioned therein as spent on duty and to pay the consequential benefits, invoking the provisions of Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

2. The respondents have refuted the claim of the applicant, filed their reply, stoutly denying all the allegations and grounds contained in the O.A and prayed for its dismissal.

3. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that during the pendency of the instant O.A, the respondents have decided the period in question and granted consequential service benefits to the applicant vide order dated 14.12.2015, in this regard.

4. Learned counsel for applicant has acknowledged, but urged that the respondents have not considered the matter, of the period with effect from 11.04.1995 to 01.05.1996, which was stoutly denied by the counsel for respondents.

5. In this view of the matter, the O.A is finally disposed of, to enable the applicant to file a fresh representation for consideration of the alleged remaining period by the respondents.

6. Needless to mention that, in case the applicant files the indicated representation, then the respondents would consider the same, as permissible in the relevant rules. At the same time, in case, the applicant still remains aggrieved by such order of the respondents, he would be at liberty to file a fresh O.A challenging the same, in accordance with law. No costs.

(V. N. Gaur)  
Member (A)

(Justice M. S. Sullar)  
Member (J)

/Maya/