

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Monday 21st day of January Two Thousand And Nineteen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE MR. P.MADHAVAN, MEMBER (J)

O.A. 310/43/2019

Lakshmi

W/o. (Late) Subramani,

Old No. 4, New No. 17,

Kamarajapuram,

Pon Nagar, Trichy- 620 001.

....Applicant

(By Advocate: M/s. C. Samivel)

Versus

1. Union of India Rep. by its
Secretary to Government of India
Department of Youth Affairs,
Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports,
Room No. 401, C-Wing, Shastri Bhavan,
New Delhi- 110 001;
2. The Director General,
Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan,
Core IV, II Floor, Scope Minar,
Lexmi Nagar, District Centre,
Delhi- 110 092;
3. The State Director/The Zonal Director,
Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan,
No.71, 2nd Main Street,
VGP Layout, Part-III,
Palavakkam, Chennai- 600 041;
4. The District Yough Coordinator,
Nehru Yuva Kendra,
Race Course Road, Khajamalai,
Opp. To Government Law College,
Triuchirappalli- 620 023. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. M. Kishore Kumar
Mr. Su. Srinivasan)

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member (A))

Heard. Applicant has filed this OA seeking the following relief:-

“to direct the respondents to fix the time scale of pay from the date of appointment and further to regularize the applicant’s service as a Sweeper and by granting all service benefits including seniority to the applicant within a stipulated period fixed by this Hon’ble Tribunal.”

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant had made various representations in the past to the competent authority seeking the aforesaid relief. However, the representations had remained un-answered and hence this OA.

3. Mr. Kishore Kumar, Learned Standing Counsel appears for Respondents 2, 3 & 4 while Mr. Su. Srinivasan, Learned Sr. Standing counsel represents respondent No.1. It is submitted that the representations were very old and it was not possible to ascertain immediately if they were considered and disposed of. The applicant has inter alia referred to a 2012 representation and it is not clear if the same was disposed of or not. Even if it was not, this OA would be barred by limitation. However, there would be no objection if the applicant is permitted to make a fresh representation regarding her grievance to the competent authority.

4. Counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant’s grievance was genuine and it would be in the interest of justice to allow her to make a fresh representation with regard to her grievance which the competent authority may be directed to consider in accordance with law.

5. Keeping in view the above and without going into the substantive merits of the applicant's case, I deem it appropriate to permit the applicant to make fresh representation regarding her grievance within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of such representation, the respondents may examine if the matter was considered previously and, if so, inform the applicant of the decision taken thereon. If the previous representations had not been disposed of, the respondents shall consider the fresh representation to be filed by the applicant in accordance with the relevant rules and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of two months thereafter.

6. OA is disposed of as above. No costs.

(P. MADHAVAN)
MEMBER (J)

(R. RAMANUJAM)
MEMBER (A)

21.1.2019

Asvs.