

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 3827 of 2024

Manjeet Singh son of late Sardul Singh, resident of North Railway Colony, Qr. No. TA/A, Near Railway Hospital, P.O and P.S. Chutia, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioner(s).

Versus.

1. Union of India through General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach, Kolkata-43.
2. Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, Hatia Division, South Eastern Railway, P.O. Hatia, P.S. Jagarnathpur, District-Ranchi.
3. Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, South Eastern Railway, Adra Division, P.O and P.S. Adra, District- Purulia.
4. Dy. Chief Engineer (Con.), Construction Organization, South Eastern railway, P.O and P.S. Ranchi, District- Ranchi. Respondents.

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the petitioner(s): Mr. Prem Pujari Roy, Advocate.

For the respondent(s): Mr. Anil Kumar, ASGI.

02/07.01.2025: In this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for quashing the order dated 7.4.2022 passed by respondent No. 2, whereby the claim of the petitioner seeking protection in the pay scale of Rs.5200-20,200 with Grade Pay of Rs.2400/- has been rejected and also to direct the respondents to compute and pay the entire difference of salary along with arrears of revision of pension in Grade Pay Rs.2400/-.

2. The aforesaid order, which the petitioner has challenged in this writ petition was passed by the Authority after the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in WPS No. 6636 of 2014 had remanded the matter after setting aside the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT).

3. In this case, the petitioner's grievance is in respect of Grade Pay. The petitioner approached the Central Administrative Tribunal, naturally so as he was an employee of Indian Railways. The order passed by the CAT was challenged by this petitioner before this Court in Division Bench by filing WPS No. 6636 of 2014 in which, the Division Bench set aside the order passed by the CAT and remanded the matter to the authority for reconsidering the case of the petitioner. The Authorities reconsidered the case and passed an order which is against the petitioner. The petitioner without approaching the Central Administrative Tribunal, which is the appropriate forum, has filed this writ petition before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. Since the remedy of the petitioner lies in different forum, which is Central Administrative Tribunal and in fact, the petitioner had earlier approached the Central Administrative Tribunal also, I am not inclined to

entertain this writ petition. the petitioner is directed to approach the Central Administrative Tribunal by challenging the impugned order.

5. Accordingly, this petition stands **disposed of**.

Anu/-Cp2.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)