

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

OA NO. 1117/2003

This the 5th day of May, 2003

HON'BLE SH. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

Ganpat Singh,
R/o H.No.17, Sector VI,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi.

...Applicant.

(By Advocate: Sh. Yogesh Sharma)

Versus


1. Union of India through the Secretary,
Ministry of Defence, South Block,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief of the Naval Staff,
Naval Head Quarter (DCP),
New Delhi.
3. The Commanding Officer,
INS India, Dalhousie Road, New Delhi.

...Respondents

ORDER ((ORAL))

Applicant impugns Annexure A-1 where designation is shown as Leading Rigger but in the next column it is stated that it should be read as HSK-II Rigger. Applicant submits that according to the respondents themselves he has been holding the post of Leading Rigger which is a skilled post and basic pay is Rs.380-560 whereas basic pay of HSK-II Rigger is only Rs.330-480. PPO has been revised giving the pay scale of Rs.330-480 whereas he is holding the post of Leading Rigger. It is also pointed out that Leading Rigger is promotional post of HSK-II Rigger.


2. Keeping in view the same, I think this OA can be disposed of at this stage itself since the applicant has been shown HSK-II Rigger instead of Leading Rigger. Before filing the OA the applicant had not filed any representation to seek rectification. Now learned counsel makes a request that this OA be treated as representation and same be decided.



[2]

TS

3. Hence, I allow the OA to the extent that this OA be treated as representation and respondents are directed to decide the same by passing a speaking order thereon within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.


(KULDIP SINGH)
Member (J)

sd