

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...  
**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00271/2017**

**Chandigarh, this the 08<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018**

...  
**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J) &  
HON'BLE MS. P. GOPINATH, MEMBER (A)**

...

Rajwant Singh son of S. Baldev Singh, age 37 years, resident of Village Faridkot, PO Kotli Sabo, via Sangat Mandi, Distt. Bathinda, presently posted as TGT PET (M) at Jawahar Navodaya Vidhalaya, Odhan, Distt. Sirsa (Haryana) (Group 'B')

**....Applicant**

**(Present: Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate)**

**Versus**

1. Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education and Literacy, # 124-C. Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi through its Secretary.
2. The Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti (An Autonomous Organisation under Ministry of HRD, Department of School Education & Literacy, Govt. of India), B-15, Institution Area, G.B. Nagar, Sector 62- Noida (UP) – 201309.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Regional Office, Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti, Jaipur Region, # 18, Sangram Colony, Mahaveer Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur – 302001.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Regional Office, Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti, Bay No. 26-27, Sector 31-A, Chandigarh.
5. Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Odhan (Sirsa) Haryana through its Principal.

..... **Respondents**

**(Present: Mr. Ram Lal Gupta, Advocate for Resp. No. 1**

**Mr. D.R. Sharma, Advocate for Respdnts No. 2 to 5)**

**ORDER (Oral)  
SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)**

1. Learned counsel for the parties are in agreement that the controversy, involved in the present O.A., has been put to rest, in an identical case titled **Murad Singh Vs. Union of India & Others** (O.A. NO. 060/00818/2017 decided on 04.07.2018) by this Court, therefore, this O.A. may be disposed of in the same terms.
2. Accordingly, the O.A. is disposed of, on consensual basis, in terms of order dated 04.07.2018 passed in the case of Murad Singh

(supra), by this Court, the operative part of which is extracted hereunder:-

“4. The learned counsel for applicant vehemently argued that the controversy involved in the instant O.A. has already been settled by this Court in O.A. No. 1163/HR/2013 -Vijay Pal Vs. Union of India and Ors. decided on 21.10.2014 where in the artificial discrimination amongst the persons , who were working prior to 1.1.2006 and after 1.1.2006 had been treated differently by the respondents , has not been approved by this Court.

5. The learned counsel for respondents very fairly submitted that the relied upon decision by the applicant has also been approved by the jurisdictional High Court by dismissing CWP at the hands of respondents wherein claim of similarly situated has already been allowed by the Court of law.

6. Considering the above noted facts, we are left with no option but to quash the impugned order and at the same time direct the respondents to consider the claim of applicant for grant of benefit in terms of the decision rendered in the case of Vijay Pal (supra) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The O.A. stands disposed of accordingly.”

**(P. GOPINATH)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**Dated: 08.08.2018**

‘mw’

