

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.1480/2013**

New Delhi, this the 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019

**Hon'ble Sh. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Lalit Raj Meena,  
Controller of Stores and Purchase  
HRDC, Ghaziabad,  
Aged about 58 years, Ghaziabad. ... Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

Council of Scientific & Industrial Research  
Through its Secretary,  
Anusandhan Bhawan,  
2, Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001. ... Respondent

(By Advocate: Shri Praveen Swaroop)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:-**

The applicant joined the service of the respondents in February, 1986. He was promoted to the post of Purchase Officer in April 1991 and as Controller of Administration/Control of Stores and Purchase in the year 1995. He contends that the MACP was not released to him though the benefit was extended to other similarly situated employees.

Reference is made to certain proceedings of the Screening Committee. The applicant complaints that the MACP was denied to him, wrongfully.

2. This OA is filed with a prayer to direct the respondent to grant PB-IV to him w.e.f. 01.09.2008 and to pay arrears, with interest.

3. The respondents filed a counter affidavit opposing the OA. It is stated that the case of the applicant for grant of MACP was considered by the Screening Committee, but on finding that one of the ACRs in the preceding five years was not up to the Bench mark, he was found unfit for MACP.

4. The OA is being listed for hearing for the past several occasions. There was no representation for the applicant. Since it is one of the oldest cases, we have perused the record and proceed to dispose of the same in accordance with Rule 15 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules,1987.

5. We heard Shri Praveen Swaroop, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the record.

6. Under the MACP scheme, an employee is entitled to be extended the benefit of upgradation of pay scale in case he did not get promotion in the three spells of ten years each. The applicant got promotion for the first two spells of ten years in service. His grievance is only for extension of the benefit of MACP for the 3<sup>rd</sup> spell of ten years.

7. The scheme provides for consideration of the case of the employees for the extension of MACP by a Screening Committee. The procedure is akin to that of selection for promotion. The only difference is that instead of DPC, the Screening committee will evaluate the eligibility of the employees. The Bench mark for the purpose of extension of benefit of MACP, for the post held by the applicant, was fixed as Very Good. When the ACRs for a period of five years, preceding the date of consideration, relevant to the applicant were taken into account, it emerged that one of the ACRs were evaluated as 'Good'. It is on account of this reason that the applicant was not found fit for MACP. No exception can be taken to the action of the respondents.

8. We, therefore dismiss the OA. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member(A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/vb/