

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

O.A.No.1677/2019

Dated Wednesday, the 18th day of December, 2019

PRESENT

Hon'ble Mr.P.Madhavan, Judicial Member

&

Hon'ble Mr.T.Jacob, Administrative Member

S. Rajendran, (61) T.I. BSNL (Rtd.),
S/o Shanmugasundaram,
Door No. 2/D, 5th Street,
Kasthuribai Nagar,
Melur, Madurai – 625 106.

...Applicant

(By Advocate M/s K.Mariappan)

Vs

1. The Chief General Manager,
BSNL,
Tamil Nadu Circle,
Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

2. The Principal General Manager,
BSNL,
Bibikulam, Madurai – 625 002.

3. The Assistant General Manager,
BSNL(HR),
Bibikulam, Madurai – 625 002.

4. The Sub-Divisional Engineer (NWOP-CM I)
Office of the Divisional Engineer (NWOP-CM I)
Tallakulam, Madurai – 625 002.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr. M.Kishore Kumar, SPC)

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

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

"....i) Grant of Provisional Pension under Rule 69 is mandatory even if Departmental and Judicial proceedings are continued.

Rule 69 of the CCS (Pension) Rules 1972 wherever delays are anticipated for granting retirement benefits provisional pension is required to be sanctioned under Rule 64 and 69 of the CCS (Pension) Rules the Head of Office/Account Officer is expected to complete the processing of pension paper well in time so that the pension is able to draw his pension immediately after his retirement.

ii) The Applicant begs to pray that direct the respondents to sanction provision pension and to pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances so the case."

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant retired as Telecom Technician on 30.06.2018 provisionally on superannuation. The grievance of the applicant is that he has not been given provisional pension even after the completion of 1 ½ years after his superannuation. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant will be satisfied if his representation produced as Annexure A9 dt. 04.11.2019 is considered and disposed of by passing a speaking order within a time limit to be stipulated by this Tribunal.

3. Mr.M. Kishore Kumar takes notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the respondents have no objection for disposal of the representation of the applicant on merits.

4. In view of the limited submission and without going into the merits of the case, the OA is disposed of in the following lines:

"The competent authority is directed to consider the applicant's representation dated 04.11.2019 as Annexure A-9 in the light of relevant rules and regulations and pass a speaking order, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

**(T.JACOB)
MEMBER (A)**

18.12.2019

**(P.MADHAVAN)
MEMBER (J)**

M.T.