

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench**

OA 310/01103/2018

Dated Friday the 14th day of September Two Thousand Eighteen

P R E S E N T

**Hon'ble Mrs. Jasmine Ahmed, Member (J)
&
Hon'ble Mr. R.Ramanujam, Member(A)**

1. P. Sakthivel
2. Vincent Antony Peter
3. Sujeesh P.S.
4. Suresh. M
5. C. Sebestin Ugin Raj
6. M. Kumar
7. K. Ramanath
8. Savitha. V.P.
9. U. Krishnan
10. K. Velmurugan
11. V. Kalaiarasan
12. Sudeep. M
13. Dileep. T.P.
14. A. Karunagaran
15. Udhayakumar. A
16. D. Satheesh Kumar
17. G. Madesh
18. Shiji. K
19. Sivanantham. P
20. R. Muthukumar
21. G. Govindhan

.. Applicants

By Advocate **M/s. R. Rajesh Kumar**

Vs.

1. Union of India
Rep. by its Secretary
Ministry of Defence
Department of Defence
New Delhi 110 001.
2. The Chairman & DGOF
Ordinance Factory Board
10/A, S.K. Bose Road
Kolkatta – 700 001.
3. The Senior General Manager
Heavy Vehicles Factory
Avadi, Chennai 600 054.
4. The Junior Works Manager
LB-II
Heavy Vehicles Factory
Avadi, Chennai 600 054.

.. Respondents

By Advocate **Mr. Su. Srinivasan**

ORAL ORDER

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mrs. Jasmine Ahmed, Member(J)

Heard Mr. R. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for applicant.
Mr. Su. Srinivasan, learned counsel for the respondents. The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:-

“To extend the benefit of the order passed in O.A. 39 & 40 of 2015 and thus call for the records pertaining to the Seniority of the Skilled Employees in the respondent organisation and quash the same with regard to the applicants and direct the respondent to refix the seniority of the applicants on the basis of merit as it was prior to the alteration by the 1st respondent and to grant all consequential benefits in lieu of it or alternatively direct the respondent to grant promotion at par with the juniors of the applicant in semi skilled grade”

2. Counsel for the applicant states that through this OA he has sought relief in this Tribunal to extend the benefit which was passed in OA 39 and 40 of 2015. In this regard counsel for the respondents informs the court that challenging the order passed in OA 39 and 40 of 2015, WP Nos. 31801 & 31775 of 2017 is pending before the Hon'ble High Court which has not been decided.
3. Counsel for the parties agree that issue in this OA is completely identical with OAs 39 and 40 of 2015.
4. We feel that it will not serve any purpose keeping this OA pending. Accordingly we direct the respondents that subject to the outcome of the WP Nos. 31801 and 31775/2017, the impugned order shall be reviewed by the respondents.

5. Accordingly this OA is disposed of.
6. Su. Srinivasan is present on behalf of the respondents.

(R. Ramanujam)
Member (A)

14.09.2018

(Jasmine Ahmed)
Member(J)

AS