

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

O.A.No.3249/2016

This the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Patnaik, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. K. N. Shrivastava, Member (A)**

Dr. Sudhir Kumar Mittal Age 59 years  
S/o Sh. I.S. Mittal Dr.-CMO  
R/o D-101, Sector-40,  
Noida, UP. .... Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri A.K. Behera)

1. The Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Through Director of Local Bodies  
Players Building, ITO, New Delhi
2. East Delhi Municipal Corporation  
Through its Commissioner  
Udyog Bhawan, Patparganj,  
New Delhi.
3. North Delhi Municipal Corporation  
Through its Commissioner  
Civic Center, New Delhi,
4. South Delhi Municipal Corporation  
Through its Commissioner  
Civic Center, New Delhi.

**ORDER(ORAL)**

**By Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Patnaik, Member(J):**

Heard Shri A.K. Behera, learned counsel for the applicant.

This OA has been filed by the applicant under Section 19 of Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985, challenging the impugned Annexure A-1 order of the respondents dated 02.05.2016 wherein the applicant has been informed of his retirement on 30.09.2016.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant is continuing her service as General Duty Medical Officer in the erstwhile Municipal Corporation of Delhi and vide order of Govt. of India issued on

31.05.2016 whereby the age of superannuation of General Duty Medical Doctors has been enhanced to the age of 65 years. Though the applicant is very much in service and before his age of retirement which is on 30.09.2016, the Circular dated 31.05.2016 has come into force, therefore, the age of retirement of the applicant may be enhanced as per the Circular dated 31.05.2016.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant has made a representation to this effect to the respondent No.2 requesting for enhancing the age of his retirement to 65 years. Till date neither age of retirement of the applicant has been enhanced by the respondents nor his representation has been decided.

4. On perusal of the record, we find that the applicant has made representation to Respondent No.1 on 07.09.2016 (Annexure A-2). Pin-pointing the points as discussed above, and without keeping the matter pending, we dispose of the instant OA at the admission stage itself, directing the respondent No.1 that if such representation dated 07.09.2016 has been preferred and stands pending consideration, then the same may be disposed of by well-reasoned order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. Though we have not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case and all the points raised in the representation are left open for the Respondent No.1 to consider the same as per rules, we made it clear that the status-quo as on date so far as continuance of the applicant in her present post will be maintained for a period of one month from the date of such consideration and communication of result.

**Issue Dasti.**

**(K.N. Shrivastava)**  
Member(A)

**(A.K. Patnaik)**  
Member(J)

