

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA/310/00624/2018

Dated Tuesday the 5th day of June Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

HON'BLE SMT. B. BHAMATHI, Member (A)

B.Baskaran,
Postal Assistant (retd),
Returned Letter Office,
O/o. Chief Postmaster General,
Chennai 600002.
Residing at :
New No. 26/6, Old No. 8/6, Old Bungalow Street,
Chintadripet, Chennai 600002.Applicant

By Advocate M/s. P.R. Satyanarayanan

Vs

Union of India rep by,
1.The Secretary,
Dept of Posts,
Ministry of Communications & IT,
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi 100001.
2.The Chief Post Master General,
Tamil Nadu Circle,
Chennai 600002.Respondents

By Advocate Mr. K. Rajendran

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Smt. B. Bhamathi, Member(A))

Heard learned counsel for applicant. The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

“8. To call for records relating to proceedings no. STC/4-37/11/dlgs dated 05.05.2017 issued by the second respondent and quash the same as arbitrary and illegal and direct the respondents to grant 2nd MACP benefits to the applicant w.e.f 01.09.2008 instead of 30.09.2012 and also grant 3rd MACP benefits w.e.f 16.10.2017 on completion of 30 years of service as Postal Assistant along with arrears of pay and allowances, pensionary and all other consequential benefits and pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.”

2. It is submitted that the applicant joined the respondent's department on 13.09.1982. He made a representation on 24.04.2017 for grant of 3rd MACP benefit to the respondents. He has relied on an order dt. 14.03.2013 passed by this Tribunal in OA 1088/2011. He received a reply dated 05.05.2017 rejecting his request stating that the aforesaid order is applicable only to the applicant therein. Aggrieved, the applicant has approached this Tribunal.

3. Mr. K. Rajendran takes notice for the respondents.

4. On perusal, it is seen that the communication dated 05.05.2017 is very cryptic and does not state the reasons as to why the said order dt. 14.03.2013 would not apply to the applicant herein.

5. Therefore, to meet the ends of justice and without going into the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to direct the 2nd respondent to

reconsider the representation of applicant dated 24.04.2017 along with the pleadings made by the applicant in this OA in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

6. OA is disposed of with the above direction at the admission stage.

(B. Bhamathi)
Member(A)
05.06.2018

SKSI