

M

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.1717/2002

Friday, this the 5th day of July, 2002

Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (A)

Illam Chand
Vill & PO Jhabrera
Distt. Hardwar,
(U.P.).

..Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri M.K.Bhardwaj)

Versus

Union of India & Others: Through

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
North Block,
New Delhi.
2. Engineer in Chief,
Army Headquarters,
Kashmere House,
New Delhi.
3. Chief Engineer,
Western Command,
Chandimandir,
4. GGDA (Grievance Cell),
West Block V
R.K.Puram [A
New Delhi-66.
5. Chief Central Defence Accounts Officer,
CCDA (Pension),
Allahabad.
6. Area Accounts Officer (P),
Western Command,
Delhi Cantt-110010.

..Respondents

Q R D E R (ORAL)

The applicant, a Superintendent Grade-I in MES, met with an accident while on duty on 11.1.1993 and lost one of his eyes. On 12.6.1993, the Garrison Engineer addressed^{ed} letter to the Medical Superintendent concerned in AIIMS, New Delhi, for issuing a certificate indicating the percentage of disability for the purpose of grant of

d

3

due compensation to the applicant. This was followed by a similar letter to the Army Hospital, Delhi Cantt. issued on 9th July, 1993. A long time elapsed thereafter and it was only on 18th February, 2000 that a letter was issued by the Ministry of Defence to the Chief of the Army Staff conveying therein a sanction for the payment of Rs.30,085/- to the applicant towards lumpsum payment in lieu of disability pension as per the CCS (Extra Ordinary Pension) Rules, 1972 on the basis that 40% disability had been caused due to ^{the} loss of the right eye in the aforesaid road accident. When the matter was pursued by the applicant, a letter dated 5th May, 2000 was received showing that the matter regarding the payment of aforesaid lumpsum amount was under consideration in the Ministry of Defence. However, no payment has been made so far. In the meanwhile, the applicant has filed further representations, the last of which is dated 16th January, 2002. There has been no response from the respondents.

2. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant and having regard to the submissions made by him and ^{the} aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I find that the interest of justice will be duly met by disposing of this OA at this very stage even without issuing notices by directing the respondents to consider the aforesaid representations filed by the applicant and pass a reasoned and a speaking order thereon expeditiously and, in any event, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of

2

9

a copy of this order.

3. The contents of the present OA will also be treated as the latest representation made on behalf of the applicant before orders, as above, are passed. I direct accordingly.

4. The OA is disposed of in the aforestated terms.
No costs.


(S.A.T. RIZVI)
Member(A)

/kd/