

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Madras Bench**

**MA/310/00584/2017 (in)(&) OA/310/00737/2017**

**Dated Friday the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March Two Thousand Eighteen**

**P R E S E N T**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.Ramanujam, Member(A)**

1. P.Subramanian
2. K.Paranthaman
3. S.Rajakumar
4. G.Balamurugan
5. K.Balakumar
6. K.Ganesan
7. R.Ramesh
8. R.Binu
9. P.Surendh Kumar
- 10.Pramod P.S.
- 11.D.Venkatesan
- 12.S.Elavazhagan
- 13.P.Venkatesan
- 14.R.Krishnamoorthy
- 15.S.Mohan Kumar
- 16.G.Venkatesan
- 17.M.Ravichandran
- 18.K.Prabhakaran
- 19.T.Senthil Kumar
- 20.M.Senthil Kumar
- 21.D.Baskaran
- 22.M.Pandia Rajan
- 23.B.Christopher
- 24.S.Suresh
- 25.N.Narasimma Prasad
- 26.T.Selva Raj
- 27.K.Ganesan .. Applicants

By Advocate **Mr.R.Rajesh Kumar**

**Vs.**

1. The Chairman & DGOF,  
Ordinance Factory Board,  
10/A, S.K.Bose Road,  
Kolkatta 700 001.
2. The Additional Director General,  
Ordinance Factory, Avadi,  
Chennai 600 054.

3. The Sr. General Manager,  
Heavy Vehicle Factory(HVF),  
Avadi, Chennai 600 054. .. Respondents

By Advocate **Mr.M.Kishore Kumar**

**ORAL ORDER**

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr.R.Ramanujam, Member(A)

Heard. The applicants have filed this OA seeking the following reliefs:-

“to set aside circular letter dated 8.5.2017 bearing Factory Order No.44and Factory Order No.1428, Factory Order No.1429 and 1433 dated 1.6.2017 issued by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, consequently direct the respondents to merge the Fitter (Armoured Fighting Vehicle) AFV Trade with General Fitter trade as per the decision taken in decision HVF JCM IV level Council (XIII Term) held on 24.11.2009 and thus to grant all consequential benefit in lieu of it and to pass such or other order as this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.”

2. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants had made representations on various dates regarding their grievances to the competent authority. In the reply to the OA/MA the respondents had stated that the representations could not be decided as the applicants in the meantime had filed this OA. It is submitted that the OA could be closed with a direction to the competent authority to take an appropriate decision.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents, however, opposes the plea and submits that the OA was liable to be dismissed on merits.
4. Keeping in view the limited prayer and as the applicants are not pressing this OA, I deem it appropriate, without going into the substantive merits of the claim to direct the respondents to pass an appropriate order in accordance with law on the representations of the applicants within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
5. OA is disposed of with the above direction. Consequently MA 584/2017 for stay stands closed. No costs.

(R.Ramanujam)  
Member(A)  
23.03.2018

/G/