

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...  
**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00193/2019**

**Chandigarh, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2019**

...  
**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)**

...

Tarsem Lal s/o Sh. Harbans Lal, aged 60 years, r/o VPO Sialba,  
Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali, Punjab – 140110.

**.....Applicant**

**(Present: Mr. K.B. Sharma, Advocate)**

**Versus**

1. The U.T. Chandigarh through its Finance Secretary-cum-Secretary Engineering Department, UT Secretariat, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
2. Chief Engineer, Union Territory, U.T. Civil Secretariat, Deluxe Building, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
3. Superintending Engineer, Project Public Health Circle, U.T. 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
4. Superintending Engineer, Electrical Circle Electrical Circle, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sector 9, Chandigarh – 160009.
5. Accountant General (A&E), U.T. Chandigarh, Sector 17, Chandigarh –160017.

.....

**Respondents**

**(Present: Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate)**

**ORDER (Oral)  
SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)**

1. Heard.
2. By way of this O.A., the applicant has prayed for issuance of a direction to the respondents to grant him the benefit of ACP in the scale of Rs.10,300 + G.P. 3800/- w.e.f. 01.11.2006 and w.e.f. 01.12.2011 in the pay scale of Rs.10,300 + 34800 + G.P. Rs.4400/- and to open the sealed cover and promote him as Superintendent Grade-II w.e.f. October, 2009.

3. Learned counsel submitted that due to involvement in a criminal case, the applicant was placed under suspension. Subsequently, his suspension was revoked and ultimately he was acquitted in the criminal case. His case for promotion was considered but the outcome thereof was kept in sealed cover. The benefit of ACP has also not been granted to the applicant by the respondents. Therefore, the applicant served a legal notice dated 28.01.2018 (Annexure A-12) on the respondents, which has not been answered till date.

4. Learned counsel makes a statement at the bar that the applicant would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to decide his representation within a specified time frame.

5. Notice.

6. At this stage, Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate, appeared and accepted notice on their behalf. He did not object to the disposal of the O.A. in the above manner. He, however, prays for six weeks time so that the respondents can ventilate the grievance of the applicant.

7. In the wake of the above, the O.A. is disposed of, in limine, with a direction to the competent authority amongst the respondents to decide the indicated legal notice (Annexure A-12) in accordance with law, by passing a reasoned and speaking order, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the O.A. shall not be construed as an expression of any opinion on the merit of the case.

No costs.

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**Dated: 27.02.2019**

‘mw’

