

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/01105/2016**

**Chandigarh, this the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2017**

...

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR, MEMBER (J)  
HON'BLE MS. PRAVEEN MAHAJAN, MEMBER (A)**

...

Kartar Singh son of Sh. Badar Sain, aged 52 years, Group-B, Training Officer, O/o Advance Training Institute, Gill Road, Ludhiana, (Punjab).

**....APPLICANT**

**(Present: Mr. Rohiteshwar Singh, Advocate proxy for Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate)**

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Skill & Development Entrepreneurship, Sharam Shakti Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Employment and Training, Ministry of Skill & Development Entrepreneurship, Sharam Shakti Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. The Director, Advance Training Institute, Gill Road, Ludhiana, (Punjab).

**....RESPONDENTS**

**(Present: Mr. Vinod K. Arya, Advocate)**

**ORDER (Oral)**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR, MEMBER (J):-**

As is evident from the record, that the applicant, Kartar Singh son of Sh. Badar Sain, has preferred the instant Original Application (OA), on variety of grounds mentioned therein the OA, mainly claiming the following two reliefs:-

(i) "That the respondents be directed to consider the applicant for promotion as Assistant Director w.e.f. 11.11.2014 (Annexure A-4) and extend all the consequential benefits from the date when the same was granted to the persons junior to the applicant as the respondents have failed to grant the promotion to the applicant despite the fact that the junior to the applicant has been promoted to the post of Assistant Director.

(ii) That the respondents be directed to decide the representation dated 11.01.2016 (Annexure A-5) and pass the appropriate order regarding promotion of the applicant."

2. On the contrary, the respondents have refuted the claim of the applicant and filed the written statement, stoutly denying all the allegations and grounds, contained in the OA and prayed for its dismissal.

3. Be that as it may, learned counsel for the parties are very fairly at *ad idem* that the representations filed by the applicant have not yet been decided by the respondents.

4. Sequel, the main contention of learned counsel, at this stage, is that, although the applicant has moved representations dated 11.11.2014 (Annexure A-4) and dated 11.01.2016 (Annexure A-5), for redressal of his grievances, but no decision has yet been taken by the Competent Authority.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, having gone through the record with their valuable assistance, after considering the entire matter and without expressing any opinion on merits, lest it may prejudice the case of either side, the present OA is disposed of with the direction to The Director General, Employment and Training, (respondent no.2) to sympathetically consider and decide the indicated representations, by passing a speaking / reasoned order and in accordance with law, within a

period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Copy ***dasti***.

**(PRAVEEN MAHAJAN)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**Dated: 22.11.2017.**

*'rishi'*

