

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00724/2019
Chandigarh, this the 17th day of July, 2019

...
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. A.K. BISHNOI, MEMBER (A)

...

Dr. Mahesh Ch Rai Prajapati aged about 49 years son of Sh. Lalsa Prajapati, resident of House No. 3923, Sector 22-D, Chandigarh (UT) presently working as Assistant Professor, College of Arts, Sector 10, Chandigarh (UT) (Group A)

....Applicant

(Present: Mr. S.S. Pathania, Advocate)

Versus

1. Chandigarh Administration through Secretary Technical Education, U.T. Chandigarh – 160009.
2. Principal-cum-HOD, Govt. College of Arts, Sector 10, Chandigarh (UT) – 160011.

.....

Respondents

(Present: Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate)

ORDER (Oral)

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel submitted that before being selected by the UPSC and appointed to the post of Lecturer on 07.02.2005 in Govt. College of Arts, the applicant rendered his services, as Lecturer, on contract basis, from 16.01.2001 to 06.02.2005, in the same college. He argued that as per the UGC Notification, 1998, the previous service is to be counted for the placement of Lecturer in Senior Scale and Selection Grade, but this benefit has not been

granted to the applicant. In support of his claim, he relied upon a decision dated 23.08.2017 in O.A. No. 060/01090/2015 titled

Smt. Shweta Bali Vs. Union of India & Others

3. Learned counsel further submitted that before approaching this Court, the applicant submitted applications 30.11.2015 & 04.03.2016 (Annexures A-10 & A-11), followed by a latest one dated 08.08.2018 (Annexure A-12) but none has been answered by the respondents till date. He suffered a statement in the Court that the applicant would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to consider and decide his claim, raised by way of indicated representations, in accordance with the rules and law cited therein, in a time bound manner.

4. Issue notice to the respondents.

5. At this stage, Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate, appears and accepts notice. He does not object to the disposal of the O.A. in the above manner. He prays that the respondents be granted two months so that they could ventilate the grievance of the applicant in view of the rules and law cited by him.

6. In the wake of above, the O.A. is disposed of, in limine, with a direction to the respondents, to consider and decide the indicated representations (Annexures A-10 to A-12) of the applicant, as per the rules and case law relied upon by him, by passing a reasoned and speaking order, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. Needless to mention that the disposal of the O.A. shall not be construed as an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case. No costs.

(A.K. BISHNOI)
MEMBER (A)

‘mw’

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)
Dated: 17.07.2019

