

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.1692/2018

Friday, this the 27th day of April 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dinesh Gupta, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Shrivastava, Member (A)**

A K Pathak, retired Section Officer, Group B

Aged about 62 years

s/o L N Pathak

r/o 296, Bagh Kare Khan

(Opp. Hindi Academy)

Kishan Ganj, Delhi – 110 007

..Applicant

(Mr. M K Bhardwaj, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union of India
Ministry of External Affairs
Through Foreign Secretary
Govt. of India, South Block
New Delhi

2. The Joint Secretary (AD)
Ministry of External Affairs, South Block
New Delhi

3. Union Public Service Commission
Through its Secretary
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road
New Delhi – 110 001

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Mr. K N Shrivastava:

The applicant retired from the post of Section Officer on 31.05.2015 from the Ministry of External Affairs on attaining the age of superannuation. His grievance is that he was eligible for promotion to the post of Under Secretary and that his name was also included in the select

list, but he was not promoted. It is stated that the name of applicant figures at Sl. No.10 in the Annexure A-4 select list dated 01.12.2015. The applicant has submitted Annexure A-1 representation dated 29.04.2016 in this regard, but the same has not yet been decided by the respondents. Mr. M K Bhardwaj, learned counsel for applicant submits that the applicant would be satisfied, at this stage, if a time bound direction is given to the respondent No.1 to decide the aforesaid pending representation.

2. Having regards to the submissions made by learned counsel for applicant and without going into the merits of the case, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage itself with a direction to the respondent No.1 to decide the aforesaid Annexure A-1 representation of the applicant, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, by passing a reasoned and speaking order. In addition to the pending representation, the applicant is also given liberty to file supplementary representation to respondent No.1, if he so wishes. Needless to say that in case he remains dissatisfied with the order to be passed by the respondent No.1 on his representation, the applicant shall have liberty to take recourse to appropriate remedy, as available to him under law.

(K.N. Shrivastava)
Member (A)

April 27, 2018
/sunil/

(Justice Dinesh Gupta)
Chairman