
(2019) 04 CAT CK 0002

In the Central Administrative Tribunal

Case No : Original Application No. 133 Of 2014

Krishan Goel

APPELLANT

Vs

Union Of India through

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-04-2019

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2019) 04 CAT CK 0002

Hon'ble Judges : L. Narasimha Reddy, J; Mohd. Jamshed, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : A. K. Singh

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

L. Narasimha Reddy, J

1. The applicant was extended the benefit of Modified Assured Career Progression (MACP) Scheme through order dated 31.12.2009 w.e.f. 31.03.2009, in the Grade Pay of Rs.7600/-, which, however, was withdrawn through order dated 04.11.2013.

The reason mentioned therein was that the applicant was already extended the benefit of upgradation of pay scale on completion of four years and accordingly, he is not entitled for the MACP. After withdrawing the MACP, the salary of the applicant was re-fixed. The applicant has challenged the orders dated 04.11.2013 and 12.04.2010.

2. It is stated that the MACP is independent of the upgradation of pay scale and there is absolutely no basis for the respondents to pass the impugned orders, that too, without issuing any notice to him.

3. The respondents filed counter affidavit, opposing the O.A. It is stated that MACP becomes extendable only if an employee is stagnating without promotion and upgradation of pay scale for a period of ten years, and in the instant case, the applicant has been extended the benefit of upgradation of pay scale on

completion of four years of service in the post.

4. There is no representation on behalf of the applicant. We heard Mr. A. K. Singh, learned counsel for respondents, and perused the records.

5. The issue involved in this O.A. was dealt with by us in some detail in the order dated 29.11.2018 passed in O.A. No.973/2013. It was held that if an employee has been extended the benefit of upgradation of pay scale in the spell of ten years, he shall not be entitled to be extended the benefit of MACP for that spell. Accordingly, the said O.A. was dismissed.

6. The challenge to the impugned orders, insofar as they have withdrawn the MACP extended to the applicant, cannot be found fault with. However, in the context of recovery, it needs to be verified as to whether the applicant was extended the benefit by the respondents on their own accord or on the basis of the representation made by the applicant.

7. We, therefore, dismiss the O.A., insofar as it is about challenge to the withdrawal of MACP from the applicant. We, however, direct that the recovery of the amount paid towards MACP to the applicant shall not be effected till a specific order is passed in that behalf, on consideration of representation, which the applicant may make, within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

There shall be no order as to costs.