

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA/310/00950/2018, OA/310/00951/2018 & OA/310/00954/2018
Dated Friday the 20th day of July Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

**HON'BLE SMT. B. BHAMATHI, Member (A)
&
HON'BLE SHRI. P. MADHAVAN, Member (J)**

1.V.Natarajan,Applicant in OA 950/2018
2.C.Munusamy,Applicant in OA 951/2018
3.T.SwaminathanApplicant in OA 954/2018

By Advocate M/s. Giridhar & Sai

Vs

1.Union of India,
rep by General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai 600003.

2.The Chief Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai 600003.

3.The Assistant Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai 600003.Respondents

By Advocate Mr. P. Srinivasan

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Smt. B. Bhamathi, Member(A))

Heard. Since all the applicants are similarly placed and have sought similar relief, a common order is being passed in all these OAs.

2. The 1st applicant has filed OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

“i. To call for the records relating to Order No. P(S)353/IX/OA01516/2017, dated 03.01.2018, passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same;

ii. To absorb the applicant in the regular post of Khalasi on par with Mr. N. Ethirajulu w.e.f. 01.05.1976 with all consequential benefits including arrears of pay and allowances;

iii. Grant notional seniority in the regular post of Khalasi by placing the applicant above Mr. N. Ethirajulu and promote him to the next higher posts of ESM III, ESM II, ESM I and Sr. Technician, respectively with all consequential benefits including arrears of pay and allowances;

iv. To revise and refix the applicant's pension in the post of Sr. Technician with effect from his date of retirement with all consequential benefits including arrears or pension, allowances and other benefits due thereon;

v. To award costs, and pass such further and other orders as may be deemed and proper and thus render justice.”

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the applicant submits that this Tribunal disposed of similarly situated OAs viz. OAs no. 854/2018, 855/2018, 856/2018, 857/2018, 858/2018, 859/2018, 860/2018, 861/2018 and 862/2018 on 09.07.2018 and a similar order could be passed.

4. Mr. P. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and he has no objection if a similar order is passed in these set of OAs.

5. On perusal, it is seen that the order dt. 09.07.2018 was passed by this Tribunal disposing of the OA 854/2018 in the following manner:

"6. As the authorities do not appear to have fully considered the representation dt. 17.07.2017, I am of the view that the ends of justice would be met in this case if at this stage, the respondents are directed to deal with the representation of the applicant dt. 17.07.2017 parawise and pass a speaking order on the relief sought by the applicant's husband within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for applicant would refer to IREM(Vol.II), Rule 2005 and allege that the applicant's husband was covered by the said rule. Accordingly, the applicant is permitted to make a supplementary representation to the respondents in this regard within two weeks which when received, may also be kept in view while passing the speaking order.

8. OA is disposed of with the above direction at the admission stage."

6. Considering the submission made by both counsels, these OAs are also disposed of at the admission stage with a similar direction as in OA 854/2018 (supra).

(P. Madhavan)
Member(J)

20.07.2018

(B.Bhamathi)
Member(A)

SKSI