

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

O. A. No.60/597/2016

Date of decision: 13.08.2018

...

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).
HON'BLE MRS. AJANTA DAYALAN, MEMBER (A).**

...

Smt. Amarjit Kaur, Age 50 years W/o Late Shri Jaspal Singh, resident of H. No.12, Bhaisa Tibba, Mansa Devi Complex, Sector-4, Panchkula. Group D.

... APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration through its Secretary, Engineering Department, U.T. Administration, Sector-9, U.T. Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.
2. Chief Engineer, Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration, U.T. Civil Secretariat, Sector- 9/D, Chandigarh.
3. Chief Engineer, Municipal Corporation, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
4. Superintending Engineer, Municipal Corporation, Public Health Circle, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
5. Executive Engineer, Municipal Corporation, Public Health Division No.1, Sector 17, Chandigarh.

... RESPONDENTS

PRESENT: Sh. Barjesh Mittal, counsel for the applicant.
Sh. Aseem Rai, counsel for respondents no.1 and 2.
Sh. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for respondents no.3 to 5.

ORDER (Oral)

...

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Learned counsel for the parties are in agreement that this petition can be disposed of in terms of order dated 03.07.2018 passed by this Court in O.A. No.60/839/2017 titled **Kewal Krishan & Ors. vs. U.T. Chandigarh & Ors.** However, Sh. Barjesh Mittal submitted that since in the present case they have also not cited judgments, therefore,

respondents be also directed to consider these judgments, while passing the order, which are as follows:

- i. Judgment dated 25.07.2016 in CWP No.23485 of 2015 titled Union of India & Anr. vs. C.A.T. Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh & Ors.
- ii. Judgment dated 23.05.2016 in CWP No.22139 of 2015 (O&M) titled Union of India vs. C.A.T. Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh & Ors.
- iii. Judgment dated 30.01.2017 in CWP No.21485 of 2014 titled C.A.T. Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh & Ors.

2. Relevant para of the order dated 03.07.2018 in the case of Kewal Krishan (supra) reads as under:

“Since no view has been taken by the respondents on claim of the applicants, therefore, we deem it appropriate at this stage to direct the competent authority to consider their claim in the light of relied upon judgments and orders passed by the respondents themselves granting similar benefit to identically placed persons. If applicants are held entitled to, then the same be released in their favour otherwise a reasoned and speaking order be passed, which be duly communicated to them. The above exercise be carried out within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”

3. In view of above, we dispose of this O.A. with an additional direction that while considering the claim of the applicant, respondents will take note of above cited judgments, as well. Parties are left to bear their costs.

(AJANTA DAYALAN)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Date: 13.08.2018.
Place: Chandigarh.

`KR`