

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH**  
**CIRCUIT SITTING : BILASPUR**

**Original Application No.203/00868/2018**

Bilaspur, this Tuesday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2019

**HON'BLE MR. RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER**  
**HON'BLE MR. B V SUDHAKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

Nand Kishore Bramhe, S/o Late Shri Shital Prasad Bramhe,  
aged about 73 years, retired EDDA (GDS), Lalburra Post  
Office, Dist. Balaghat, R/o : Village – Pandarwani, District :  
Balaghat (MP) **-Applicant**

**(By Advocate – Shri B.P. Rao)**

**V e r s u s**

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of  
Communication, Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi  
– 110001.

2. The Director (Postal Services) M.P Circle, CPMG Office,  
Bhopal – 451004 (MP).

3. The Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Balaghat Division, Balaghat –  
(MP) **-Respondents**

**(By Advocate – Shri Surendra Pratap Singh)**

**O R D E R (O R A L)**

**By Ramesh Singh Thakur, JM.**

This Original Application has been filed by the applicant  
for non-consideration of his representation regarding grant of  
pension.

2. The applicant has sought for the following reliefs:

“8.1 That, the Hon’ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an order, directing the Respondents to consider and decide the Applicant’s pending Representation dated 15.3.2018 (A-3) at the earliest.

8.2 That, the Hon’ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an order, directing the Respondents to consider atleast Minimum Pension to the Applicant from the date of retirement on the basis of his about 30 Years service as EDDA in the Postal Department.”

3. The case of the applicant is that he worked as EDDA on 19.08.1980 and worked as such till attaining the age of superannuation on 17.07.2010. The applicant was paid Severance Amount, Ex-gratia Gratuity and Group Insurance, as retiral benefits. He submitted a representation on 15.03.2018 (Annexure A-3) for payment of pension for the services rendered by him as EDDA. However, the same has not been decided. Hence, this O.A.

4. The respondents have filed their reply. It has been submitted by the respondents that the applicant was engaged as Gramin Dak Sevak (Extra Departmental Agent) in the year 1980 and on attaining the age of 65 years, he was retired from service in the year 2010. It has been further submitted by the respondents that as per ED Rules, the applicant is not entitled for the pension, as claimed by him. The EDA (Gramin Dak

Sevak) does not fall within the ambit of civil employee. Hence they are not entitled for pension.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant has relied upon the orders passed by the Principle Bench of this Tribunal in Original Application No.749/2015 & other connected OAs decided on 17.11.2016. The relevant para 20 of the order reads as under:

*“20. To summarise, we dispose of the O.As. with the following directions to the respondents:*

*(a) For all Gramin Dak Sevaks, who have been absorbed as regular Group ‘D’ staff, the period spent as Gramin Dak Sevak will be counted in toto for the purpose of pensionary benefits.*

*(b) Pension will be granted under the provisions of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 to all Gramin Dak Sevaks, who retire as Gramin Dak Sevak without absorption as regular Group ‘D’ staff, but the period to be counted for the purpose of pension will be 5/8th of the period spent as Gramin Dak Sevak. Rule 6 will accordingly be amended.*

*(c) The Gramin Dak Sevaks (Conduct and Engagement) Rules, 2011 are held to be valid except Rule 6, as stated above.*

*(d) The claim of Gramin Dak Sevaks for parity with regular employees regarding pay and allowances and other benefits available to regular employees, stands rejected.”*

5.1 Learned counsel for the applicant further submitted that the said order of the Principal Bench has also been taken into consideration by the Madras Bench of this Tribunal, while

passing the order in Original Application No.1676/2014 on 13.01.2017. The relevant Para 37, relied upon by him, is extracted below:

*“37. In the conspectus of the above facts and circumstances of the case and in the light of our discussion herein above, since the Principle Bench has already passed an order on similar claims, we feel it appropriate to grant liberty to the applicants to submit a representation to the respondents in the light of the order of the CAT, Principle Bench in OA 749/2015, etc dated 17.11.2016 cited supra within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, which the respondents shall dispose of by a reasoned and speaking order, keeping in view the directions contained in the said order and any further measures taken by them in pursuance thereof within a period of 3 months thereafter. The OA's are disposed of accordingly.”*

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents has relied upon the recent judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India & ors. vs. Gandiba Behera** in Civil Appeal No.8497/2019, decided on 08.11.2019. In Para 20 of the judgment, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:

*“20. For the reasons we have already discussed, we are of the opinion that the judgments under appeal cannot be sustained. There is no provision under the law on the basis of which any period of the service rendered by the respondents in the capacity of GDS could be added to their regular tenure in the postal departmental for the purpose of fulfilling the period of qualifying service on the question of grant of pension.”*

7. From the above, it is clear that law has been settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court on the issue whether services rendered by the GDS can be counted for the purposes of grant of pension. The same has been replied in negative. Hence, the applicant seeking similar relief, is not entitled for grant of pension in view of the law laid down in the case of **Gandiba Behera** (supra).

8. Accordingly, the O.A is dismissed being devoid of merit.  
No order as to costs.

**(B V Sudhakar)**  
**Administrative Member**

**(Ramesh Singh Thakur)**  
**Judicial Member**

am/-