

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench**

OA 310/00072/2020

Dated Tuesday the 21st day of January Two Thousand Twenty

P R E S E N T

**Hon'ble Shri. P. Madhavan, Member (J)
&
Hon'ble Shri. T. J acob, Member (A)**

B.Lavakumar,
S/o.R.Balarama Pillai,
No.5/60006-100-GMC Street,
Ikkadu Village,
Thiruvallur 602 021.

... Applicant

By Advocate **M/s S.RamaswamyRajarajan**

Vs

1.Union of India, Rep., by
The Chief Postmaster General,
Tamilnadu Circle,
Chennai 600 002.

2.The Senior Superintendent,
Airmail Sorting Division,
Chennai 600 027.

...Respondents

By Advocate **Mr. Su. Srinivasan**

ORAL ORDER

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Member(J)

The applicant has filed this OA under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

“(i)To direct the respondents to grant the benefit of old pension scheme to the applicant based on the judgement given by the Hon'ble High court of Madras in W.P.No.28647 of 2017, with all consequential benefits and

(ii)To pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case with cost.”

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was initially appointed as Mazdoor in the year 1988 and subsequently conferred with temporary status in the year 2001 and since then working as a temporary Group 'D' employee at various branches without getting regularisation as permanent Group 'D' employee and had retired from service on 30.11.2018, without getting any pensionary benefits even after rendering 30 years of long service. He submits that similarly placed person K. Hemavathy had been granted pensionary benefits and the same was also implemented by the respondents. The applicant gave representation to the respondents to extend the same benefit to him also which is still pending with the respondents for consideration. He submits that the applicant will be satisfied if his representation is disposed of by passing a speaking order within a time limit stipulated by this Tribunal.

3. Mr. Su. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and submits that he has no objections in disposing of the representation pending before the competent authority.

4. In view of the limited submission made and without going into the substantive merits of the case, the competent authority is directed to consider Annexure A5 representation of the applicant dated 09.08.2019 in the light of the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in WP No. 28647 of 2017 and other relevant rules and regulations on the subject and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

5. OA is disposed of at the admission stage.

(T. Jacob)
Member(A)
AS

21.01.2020

(P. Madhavan)
Member (J)