CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA 2839/1999

New Delhl, this the 29th day of September, 2000. Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Km. Saroj, d/o late Shri Mehar Chand Ekta Apartments A2/B, MIG Flat 108A, Paschim Vihar New Delhi - 110 063.

....Applicant.

(By Advocate : Sh. L.R.Khatana)

VERSUS

 Enginer-in-Chief, Army Headquarters Kashmir House, DHQ PO, New Delhi 110 011

- Chief Engineer Baraeilly Zone, Sarvatra Bhavan, Station Road, Bareilly Cantt - 243001.
- Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Pension and Pensioners' Welfare Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions Lok Nayak Bhawan, New Delhi - 110 003.

....Respondents.

(By Advocate : Sh. V S R Krishna)

ORDER (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S.Tampi, Member (A)

In this case, the point for consideration is
the grant of pensionary benefits in respect of a
retired, a deceased employee.

Prem Nath who was working with the 2. superannuated on 31-1-97, but before he received pensionary benefits, he passed away on 22-3-1998. the his brother has been shown as Originally, dependent of the deceased, which was not accepted. the brother, he had left behind one Besides who was staying away and another unmarried sister with whom he was staying at the time of sister and who is the applicant in this case. The



had we're disposed of the representation filed Department on behalf of the deceased's individual's brother insisteng, that a succession certificate was necessary shown in the order dated 17-8-99. Subsequently, the brother and married sister informed that they were no longer claimants to the benefits and that the same could be given to the applicant, who was the unmarried sister. Sh. L.R.Khatana, learned counsel for applicant points out that the insistence the succession certificate was in correct; as in terms of the rules, the applicant being unmarried sister constituted the family of the deceased. Therefore, the denial of pensionary benefits to her, for want of succession certificate was wrong, according to the counsel.

(خ

- 3. Sh. Krishna, learned counsel for the respondents disagrees and endorss the action taken by the respondents; as correct. Without a proper succession certificate, the respondents could not have made over any payment to the applicant or any other individual, without their facing a charge of having made payment to a wrong person. Respondents had all sympathy with the case of the applicant, but would not like to be faced with the charge that they had made incorrect payment.
- 4. I have carefully considered the matter. It is not disputed that the pensionary benefits in respect of the services performed by the deceased still remain with the Government, as the same was not paid to him during his lifetime, though he died more than a year after his retirement. Both his brother

M

and his married sister have intimated that the dues be paid to their unmarried sister, i.e. applicant. the respondents indicate that however, before payment is being effected they would like to be sure payment is made to the correct person. the In the Rule (2) (1) (6) of the GPF of Rules, unmarried sister is member of the deceased individual's family and as such is to the therefore, the person is able to produce before authority at the prevo showing her relation with the deceased individual, the same should be acceptable.

لد

circumstances, of with the directions to the respondents to disposed consider favourably the case of the applicant for the payment, on her making а representation satisfactory proof other than the statutory succession certificate. There could include the ration certificate from at least two individuals of the locality. This may be done within two months from the date of receipt of this order. also award the cost intimated at Rs. 1000/- to the applicant.

5

(Govindan S.Tampi)
Member (A)

/vikas/