

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

O.A.No.310/01155/2018

Dated Wednesday, the 29th day of August, Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

**HON'BLE MRS.JASMINE AHMED, MEMBER(J)
&
HON'BLE SHRI T.JACOB, MEMBER(A)**

C.Jeyaraj,
S/o G.Chelliah Pillai,
No.4, 4th Street,
Vaishnavi Nagar,
RCSC Post,
Chennai 600 109.

... Applicant

By Advocate M/s S.RamaswamyRajaraman

Vs.

1.Union of India rep., by
The Secretary, Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
Department of Pensions & Pensioners
Welfare, Lok Nayak Bhawan,
New Delhi 110 003.

2.The Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
Department of Defence Production,
136, South Block,
New Delhi.

3.The Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension),
Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad 211 014.

4.The Senior General Manager,
Heavy Vehicles Factory,
Avadi, Chennai 600 054.

... Respondents

By Advocate Mr.Su.Srinivasan

ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mrs.JASMINE AHMED, Judicial Member)

The applicant has filed this OA under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

“(i)To direct the respondents to grant the grade pay of Rs.4600 in the Pay Band-2 in the pre-revised scale of Rs.6500-10500 in replacement of grade pay of Rs.4200 and to refix the pension taking into account the Grade Pay as Rs.4600 w.e.f 01.01.2006 at par with post-2006 retirees and to pay arrears with reasonable interest and
(ii)To pass such furthe or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the ccase with cost.”

2. Heard Mr.RamaswamyRajaraman, learned counsel for the applicant. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that way back in the year 2013, the applicant gave a representation to the respondents for grant of revised pay structure of Grade Pay of Rs.4600 in PB-2 to the post that existed in the pre-revised scale of Rs.6500-10500 in replacement of Grade Pay of Rs.4200. It is the contention of the counsel for the applicant that the respondents, till date has not taken any action on his representation. He also contends that the applicant being a pensioner it is a recurring cause of action, there is no need of filing delay condonation application.

3. Mr.Su.Srinivasan, standing counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4. In view of the above circumstances, we direct the respondents to take a decision on his representation dated 25.02.2013 by passing a detailed, reasoned & speaking order within six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Accordingly, the OA is disposed of. It is made clear that nothing has been commented on the merits of the case.

(T.JACOB)
MEMBER (A)

(JASMINE AHMED)
MEMBER (J)

29.08.2018

M.T.