

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Madras Bench**

**OA 310/00200/2020**

**Dated Wednesday the 12<sup>th</sup> day of February Two Thousand Twenty**

**P R E S E N T**

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

S. Arun  
No. 20, Ambedkar Street  
Tirur Village & Post  
Sevvapet Road  
Tiruvallur District 602 025. ....Applicant

**By Advocate M/s. K. Manickaraj**

Vs

1. Union of India represented by  
The General Manager  
Southern Railway  
Park Town, Chennai 600 003.

2. The Principal Chief Personnel Officer  
Southern Railway, Park Town  
Chennai 600 003.

3. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer  
Chennai Division, Southern Railway  
Park Town, Chennai 600 003. ....Respondents

**By Advocate Mr. P. 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 call for records pertains to the grievances of the applicant and direct the respondents to consider the request of the applicant and to direct the respondents to sanction the family pension to the applicant under the second proviso to clause (v) of Sub Rule 6 of Rule 75 of Railway Services (Pension) Rules 1993, with effect from 16.10.2012 with arrears of family pension.

ii. Such other appropriate orders as deemed fit by this Tribunal”

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant submits the applicant is the son of Late L. Somu who died while in service on 21.07.2005. After the death of the L. Somu family pension was granted to his first wife Santhammal. The ex-employee married one Vennila as second wife with the consent of first wife and four children were born through her. It is submitted that after the death of first wife, the applicant who is orthopedically handicapped person with 75% of disability is entitled for lifetime family pension according to the Indian Railway Pension Rules 1993. In this regard, the applicant submitted representation produced as Annexure A6 dt. 28.03.2019 which is 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. P. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and submits that he has no objection in disposing of the representation of the applicant 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 A6 representation dt. 28.03.2019 submitted by the applicant if supported by documents to prove status in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of four 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

12.02.2020

(P. Madhavan)  
Member (J)