

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A No. 180/00945/2018

Friday, this the 12th day of July, 2019.

CORAM:

HON'BLE Dr. K.B. SURESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER

1. Jaikrishan Narayan, 48 years,
S/o. S. Narayanan,
Sr. Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at 'Chandradhanus',
Nandan Plaza, Poovar (P.O), Trivandrum.
2. Sreekumar K, 54 years,
S/o. K. Kuttan Pillai,
Sr. Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at Puthiyakada,
Thekkeveedu, Thirupuram, Trivandrum.
3. I. Johnson, 52 years,
S/o. Idichandy,
Sr. Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at : Plachivila Jisha Villa,
Kundara, Kollam.
4. P.V. Pradeep, 51 years,
S/o. M.N. Vasudevan Namboothiri,
Senior Technician/AC, SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division of
Southern Railway. Residing at Pranavam,
Irukunnam, Trivandrum.
5. Benadict M., 53 years,
S/o. J. Manuel,
Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at : Shangrila,
Karikonam (P.O), Trivandrum.

6. Devakumar Varma R., 51 years
S/o. K. Ravivarma,
Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at Sudarshanam,
Panachipara, Poonjar (P.O), Kottayam.
 7. Sharma K.P, 55 years,
S/o. V.M. Podiyan,
Technician/AC/O/SSE/Electrical,
Kochuveli, Trivandrum Division,
Southern Railway. Residing at Ashis Bhavan,
Kodukulanji (P.O), Chengannur.
- Applicants

[By Advocate M/s. Varkey & Martin]

Versus

1. General Manager,
Southern Railway, Park Town,
Chennai – 600 003.
 2. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway, Trivandrum Division,
Trivandrum – 14.
- Respondents

[By Advocate : Mr. Millu Dandapani]

The application having been heard on 12.07.2019, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

Per: Dr. K.B.Suresh, Judicial Member

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant.

2. The matter relates to overtime allowance, travelling and night duty allowance. The respondents submit that they were unsure of how to handle the situation in view of the several complaints raised by the passengers and others similarly situated. Apparently, passengers had complaint of many infractions of people like these and therefore, they

are considering doing something about the matter. Without any doubt, this is squarely within their competence, if the workmen are not performing their duties then, they cannot be expected to have special benefits like this. But at the same time, it appears to be that these benefits, if to be granted, are granted as a percentage of their pay. The case of the applicants is that their pay had now been revised following grant of MACP to some of them with retrospective effect, they would say with effect from 06.04.2014. Whether, from this point onwards the amounts are due to them or not is not very clearly available from the statement of the learned counsel for the respondents. Therefore, I will remit the matter back to the respondents to consider all the matters and do the needful within two months next, if the amounts are to be rightfully granted to the applicant, then it must be done within that time or else the respondents may pass a speaking order explaining the reason there are and as a consequence we will uphold the applicants' right to challenge it in a separate O.A.

3. O.A is disposed of as above. No order as to costs.

(Dated, 12th July, 2019.)

(Dr. K.B. SURESH)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

ax

Applicant's Annexures

- Annexure A-1 - True copy of the Office Order No. 10/2016/Elec./AC dated 11.02.2016.
- Annexure A-2 - True copy of the representation submitted by the first applicant 05.06.2017.

Annexures of Respondents

NIL
