

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JODHPUR BENCH, JODHPUR**

**Original Application No.290/00042/2019**

Jodhpur, this the 21<sup>st</sup> February, 2019

**CORAM**

**Hon'ble Smt Hina P. Shah, Judicial Member**  
**Hon'ble Ms Archana Nigam, Admn. Member**

Banshi Lal S/o Shri Prahlad By caste Khatik aged 63 years, R/o Gali No. 7, Kalal Colony, Jodhpur-342001. Retired from the post of Senior Technician (Moulder), under Chief Works Manager, Carriage Workshop, North Western Railway, Jodhpur (Raj.).

.....Applicant

By Advocate : Mr Dilip Vyas.

Versus

1. Union of India, through General Manager, N W Railways, Malviya Nagar, Jawahar circle, Jaipur-342001.
2. The Chief Works Manager, North West Railway, Jodhpur-342001.
3. The Senior Personnel Officer, North West Railway, Jodhpur-342001.
4. The Secretary, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.

.....Respondents

**ORDER (Oral)**

**Per Smt. Hina P. Shah**

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant.
2. The limited issue involved in the present OA is that whether applicant herein after completion of one full year service on 30.06.2015 is entitled for one notional increment.

3. During course of admission-hearing, Mr Dilip Vyas, learned counsel for the applicant submits that in light of judgment of Hon'ble Madras High Court passed in P. Ayyamperumal Vs The Registrar, CAT & Ors passed in W.P. No. 15732/2017 dated 15.09.2017, applicant is entitled for one notional increment for the purpose of pensionary benefits which would have been due to him w.e.f. 01.07.2015 had he not been retired w.e.f. 30.06.2015 after attaining the age of superannuation. The contention of the learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant is similarly situated person and the same benefits should be given to him.

4. On a pointed query from this Tribunal whether applicant submitted any representation to the respondents in this regard, learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has submitted representation dated 27.12.2018 (Annex. A/6) to respondent No. 2, which is pending consideration. He, however, submits that applicant would be satisfied if a time bound direction is given to the respondents who are highly placed for taking such policy decision, to decide his representation taking into account contentions made in the OA.

5. Looking to the facts and circumstances of filing the present OA and submissions made by counsel for the applicant, in our considered view, it would be appropriate to direct the respondents to decide the representation of the applicant in a time bound manner in consultation with higher authorities.

6. Accordingly, OA is disposed of with the direction to respondent No. 1 to decide representation dated 27.12.2018 (Annex. A/6) filed by the applicant, while treating the OA as an additional representation, in consultation with higher/competent authority as policy issue is involved in the present OA. The respondent No. 1 shall decide the representation by a speaking order within 03 months period from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, on merits. Thereafter, if any grievance remains, the applicant may approach appropriate forum, if so advised. Further, it is made clear that issue of period of limitation is kept open for consideration by appropriate forum.

**[Archana Nigam]**  
**Administrative Member**

**[Hina P. Shah]**  
**Judicial Member**

Ss/-