

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No. 354/99

New Delhi this the 17th day of November, 2000.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE-CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. GOVINDAN S. TAMPI, MEMBER (ADMN)

Shri S.B. SharmaApplicant


(By Advocate Shri A.K. Behera)

-Versus-

Union of India & AnotherRespondents

(By Advocate Shri A.K. Bhardwaj)

1. To be referred to the Reporters ~~or not?~~ YES ✓
2. To be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? No


(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
Vice-Chairman (J)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.354/99

New Delhi this the 17th day of November, 2000.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE-CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. GOVINDAN S. TAMPI, MEMBER (ADMNV)

Shri S.B. Sharma,
S/o late Pt. Ram Kishan,
R/o 242/2, Delhi Road
Opp. Saraswati Hospital,
Gurgaon-122 001 (Haryana)

...Applicant

(By Advocate Shri A.K. Behera)

-Versus-

1. Union of India through:
Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.

2. Chief Administrative Officer (Vig.) &
Joint Secretary (Trg.),
C-II Hutments,
DHQ Post Office,
New Delhi-110 011.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Shri A.K. Bhardwaj)

O R D E R

By Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy, Vice-Chairman (J):

The applicant seeks to quash the order of forfeiture of pension and DCRG and seeks a direction for payment of the same along with interest at the rate of 18% per annum from the date they became due.

2. The facts in brief are as under:

2.2 The applicant joined service with the respondents as LDC in the year 1958. He was promoted as Assistant, Group 'B' post, in 1979 and retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation on 30.6.94 as Assistant Civilian Staff Officer (ACSO for short). He was served with a memorandum in 1992 wherein it was alleged on the basis of an anonymous complaint that he had amassed wealth, disproportionate to the known sources of his income

and that on detailed investigation it was found that his known sources of income came to 6,58,746/- while his assets plus expenditure incurred during the last thirty five years of service worked out to Rs,17,07,000/-. Thus there was a yawning difference between the income and expenditure of the applicant. He was asked to show cause as to why disciplinary action should not be initiated. He submitted his explanation, denying the allegations. On 23.6.94, on the eve of his retirement he was served with a charge memo. An enquiry was ordered and the enquiring authority submitted its report on 24.7.97, holding that the charge was proved. Thereupon the President of India considering the facts of the case, report of the enquiring authority, finding that the charge was established, awarded him the punishment of forfeiture of pension and DCRG by the order dated 9.9.98. This order is now impugned in this case.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant, Shri A.K. Behera submits that the applicant was unjustly deprived of his pensionary benefits which have been earned by him by virtue of his long and hard service extending over a period of more than 36 years. The entire proceedings had been initiated only on the basis of an anonymous complaint, though clear instructions were given to the department not to act upon anonymous complaints. On top of it, the said complaint was also not supplied to the applicant. He further contends that, the applicant had clearly explained about his income and assets and expenditure which should have removed all the doubts in the enquiry officer's mind as to the baseless nature of allegations and that he should have exonerated the applicant.

4. It is then argued that the charges are wholly baseless and the case suffers from 'no evidence'. The alleged disparity in the income was not proved by any material on record. Conjectures were freely drawn to substantiate the allegations. It is also contended that though the onus of proof was on the prosecution to prove each and every item of the alleged excess income but the onus was placed on the applicant. Substantial portion of the salary was also omitted, non-existent properties were brought on record to inflate the assets and the expenditure was thus shown far in excess than what had been incurred. Thus, it is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that the impugned order is wholly perverse and is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents strongly urges that there is voluminous evidence before the enquiry officer which established the charge and the same cannot be interfered with. The jurisdiction of the Tribunal being limited to judicial review, the same cannot be extended to appreciation of evidence on record. The enquiry officer on the basis of pre-ponderance of probabilities and on proper assessment of the material on record had rightly come to the conclusion that the applicant had possessed disproportionate assets. The same was accepted by the disciplinary authority. He, therefore, argues that the OA has to be dismissed.

6. We have given careful and anxious consideration to the contentions raised and have perused the entire material on record. There can be no controversy



as to the onus of proof of the allegations made in the charge. allegations as regards the possession of assets and expenditure should have necessarily to be proved by the prosecution. It is no doubt true that in the disciplinary proceedings it is permissible that the proof can be established by pre-ponderance of probabilities but there should be some material to draw any inferences. It is, therefore, necessary for us to examine whether there is any evidence on record in support of the findings of the Enquiry Officer.

7. According to the charge the following are the details of income, assets and expenditure:

"(a) Income from salary, landed property etc.

(i)	Pay & allowances	Rs.3,35,746.00
(ii)	Income by him as his share out of house sold at Gurgaon.	Rs.1,23,000.00
(iii)	Approximate income from agricultural land crops etc.	Rs.2,00,000.00
	Total	<u>Rs.6,58,746.00</u>

(b) Assets

(i)	Construction cost of house No.242/2, Delhi Gurgaon Road.	Rs.2,00,000.00
(ii)	Three shops in plot No.242/2, Gurgaon Road.	Rs.30,000.00
(iii)	Purchase of house No.132 Sec. 7, Gurgaon in 5/91.	Rs.4,00,000.00
(iv)	Payment made for 2 plots in the name of his two daughters in Shiv Akanksha Housing Society.	Rs.40,000.00
(v)	TV/VCR/Fridge & Other Household items.	Rs.2,00,000.00
	Total	<u>Rs.8,70,000</u>

(c) Expenditure

(i) Telephone	Rs.15,000.00
(ii) Amount spent on marriage of his daughter Miss Rita in 2/89.	
(a) Maruti Car	Rs.1,00,000.00
(b) BPL TV	Rs.8,000.00
(c) Fridge	Rs.8,000.00
(d) Jewellery, Cash & other gifts	Rs.2,50,000.00
(iii) Amount spent on the marriage of 2nd daughter Miss Meena in 2/92.	
(a) Maruti Car	Rs.1,20,000.00
(b) Jewellery, food & other items	Rs.2,00,000.00
(iv) Education of Children (at the min. 10% of carry home salary)	Rs.34,000.00
(v) Household expenditure (@30% of carry home salary)	Rs.1,03,000.00
Total	<u>Rs.8,37,000"</u>

8. The income is shown at Rs.6,58,746/- whereas the assets and expenditure are shown at Rs.17,07,000/-. Thus the difference between the income and the alleged assets and expenditure came to 10,48,254/-. After the enquiry, the income was arrived at Rs.7,24,407/- whereas expenditure including assets came to Rs.12,28,600. The difference came to Rs.5,03,193/-.

9. The applicant was also charged for not filing the movable/non-movable property returns thus violating Rule 18 of the CCS (Conduct) Rules. The enquiry officer found that the applicant was guilty on this count also.

10. The law is well settled that the Tribunal is not permitted to interfere with the findings of facts arrived at by the enquiry officer. The enquiry has to be done by the enquiry officer and not by the Tribunal. He is

permitted to draw reasonable inferences on the basis of evidence and unless there is no evidence on record whatsoever or the findings are so unreasonable as no reasonable person would arrive at such findings, it is not permissible for the Tribunal to interfere with them.

11. We will now take up whether the income of the applicant has been properly computed. In this regard the various items of income were shown at para 6.17, in a tabular form, which is as under:

Income	Alleged by D.A.	Accepted by CO	Justified by
4.1 Pay and allowances of CO.	3,35,746	4,25,000	3,10,836
4.2 Sale of House	1,23,000	1,23,000	1,23,750
4.3 Agr. land/crops	2,00,000	3,18,300	2,00,000
4.5 Loan from the society.	-	55,000	55,000
4.6 Advance from GPF	-	6,000	6,000
4.7 Salary arrear	-	3,059	3,059
4.8 Sale of old gold	-	19,966.50	18,966.00
4.9 Sale of scooter	-	6,000	-
4.10 Advance from Sh. Vijay Singh	-	50,000	-
4.11 Advance from Sh. Sube Singh	-	1,50,000	-
4.12 Income of his son and daughter	-	2,53,263	-
4.14 Loan from Brother-in-Law.	-	-	6,800.00
		Total	<u>7,25,407</u>

12. According to the applicant the only income of the applicant is his salary over 36 years of his service starting as LDC and ending as Group 'B' officer. The total of pay and allowances as shown in the chargesheet are

Rs.3,35,746/- but no period was mentioned in the chargesheet. According to the enquiry officer the amount of salary and allowances from 5/58 to 5/64 was not shown in the chargesheet due to the non-availability of the information. Even according to him the income for the period of 12 years 7 months had been omitted from calculation of the income of the applicant. This amounted to Rs.48,226/-. But this calculation appears to be wholly arbitrary. It is seen from the enquiry officer's report itself that from 1958 to 1964 for six years the average salary at Rs.144/- was taken at Rs.10,368/-. Actual amounts drawn towards salary were not shown. No step were taken to get the actual amount. If the correct figures were taken into consideration the amount should have been much more. The applicant estimated the total amount of income towards the salary and allowances at 4,24000/- but he has also not given any figures to substantiate the said amount. Thus, the only conclusion that could be drawn from this is that the findings as to the total amount of pay and allowances was not arrived at on the basis of actual drawn but only on conjectures.

12. As regards the advance from Vijay Singh and Sube Singh Rs.50,000/- and 1,50,000/- it is the case of the applicant that they were forfeited by the applicant hence should be treated as the income of the applicant. But they were rejected by the enquiry officer. It is, therefore, necessary to consider this aspect. The enquiry officer rejected these items only on the ground that the formalities of iqrarnama was not complied with and that it was also not a declared income. The learned counsel contends that no registration was necessary for entering

into an agreement nor should it be intimated to the Government. The case of the applicant is that as the agreement of sale could not be completed the said advances have been forfeited. In support of these two items two agreements exhibit 2 (a) and 3 (b) were placed on record. Thus, on two grounds this amount was not computed in the income of the applicant, (i) sale was not completed and no sale deed was filed and (ii) these transactions were not intimated to the Government as required under Rule 18 of CCS (Conduct) Rules. As the intending purchaser has not paid the balance amount the advance amounts were forfeited. According to the applicant these transactions being not transferred by sale or any other document they need not be intimated to the Government under Rule 18 of the CCS (Conduct) Rules. Rule 18 (1) (ii), which is relevant, reads:

"(ii) Every Government servant belonging to any service or holding any post included in Group 'A' and Group 'B' shall submit an annual return in such form as may be prescribed by the Government in this regard giving full particulars regarding the immovable property inherited by him or owned or acquired by him or held by him on lease or mortgage either in his own name or in the name of any member of his family or in the name of any other person."

13. The rule contemplates intimation to the Government in the case of acquisition or disposal of any immovable property either by lease, mortgage, purchases, gifts or otherwise. If such transaction is with the persons having personal dealing with him it should be done with the previous sanction of the prescribed authority. There is no allegation that there was any acquisition or transfer of any immovable property in the present case. This rule comes into play only when there is such an acquisition or transfer. According to the applicant as the

agreement could not be completed inasmuch as the money was not paid within the stipulated period. Hence, transfer of property was not effected. This rule contemplates the filing of annual return by an officer holding 'A' and 'B' posts regarding immovable property owned or acquired by him or held by him either on lease or mortgage. The imputation as to advance of Rs.50,000/- from Vijay Singh was rejected on two grounds, (i) the iqarnama (Exhibit 2-e) was not registered and (ii) it was not a declared income. We are not interfering with this item as it was rightly ignored since the alleged agreement was not registered. The second advance viz. Rs.1,50,000/- appears to be acceptable. The applicant has shown this item as having been forfeited by him from one Sube Singh as the total amount was not paid by the purchaser as per the terms and conditions mentioned in Exhibit 3-e. The total consideration under the agreement was Rs.6 lacs and the balance amount was to be paid by 12.12.90 failing which the advance amount of Rs.1,50,000 was to be forfeited and accordingly the said amount was forfeited and it was truly reflected in his income. It is not in controversy that this agreement has been registered with the sub Registrar Gurgaon and the same was approved by the sub Registrar. But this was not accepted only on the ground that this amount was not shown either to the department or to the Income Tax authorities. In our view the enquiry officer fell into an error in treating that it was to be declared under Rule 18 of the CCS (Conduct) Rules. As seen supra as there was no sale by any method it was not an item to be informed to the department. On the mere ground that it was not declared to the income tax authorities in his return cannot be a ground to disregard the fact which has been proved by the applicant in order to

(21)

disprove the allegations against him in this case. In the charge of disproportionate income and assets what is to be established by the prosecution was whether the amounts or the assets shown are true. They cannot be rejected out-right only on the ground of non-intimation to the income authorities or for that matter to the department. Non-intimation is another article of charge which has to be considered separately when the said misconduct would come for consideration. If the charged officer disproves any allegation it has to be considered on its own merit and ~~not~~ ^{it cannot be} ~~rejected solely~~ on the ground of non-intimation to the department concerned. Thus, in our view the rejection of Rs.1,50,000 shown at para 4.11 under the Head of Income is wholly arbitrary.

14. The next item is as regards the item 'income of his son and daughter'. The applicant was shown an amount of Rs.2,53,263 in his income being the pay and allowances of his daughter and son. The pay and allowances of his daughters and son are as follows:

Income of Rs.2,53,263.00 of his one daughter and one son, as given below, may also be considered my income:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------------|
| (i) | Pay & Allowances of Ms. Rita Sharma | 1,671.00 |
| | for the period from 7.7.88 to 26.8.88. | |
| | as per Ex.D-1. | |
| (ii) | Pay & allowances of Ms. Rita Sharma | 22,800.00 |
| | for the period from 10.10.88 to 1.3.89 | |
| | @ Rs.4,000/- p.m. as per Ex.D-2. | |
| (iii) | Pay of my son, S.P. Sharma, as per | 2,28,792.00 |
| | Ex.D-3 upto 1991-92. | |

Total... 2,53,263.00

15. Both the grounds have been accepted by the enquiry officer. We are not interfering in the item shown against his daughter ie. Rs.23,471 as she had kept the

money separately for herself for her own, opening the account in her own name in the Bank. But as regards the pay and allowances of his son Rs.2,28,792/- it appears that the same was disregarded without any basis and on wholly unsustainable grounds. The only ground on which it was not accepted by the enquiry officer was that no evidence was forthcoming as to his son being a member of HUF. It is not the case of the prosecution that his son was living separately from his father or that he has a separate bank account depositing his income and utilising it for his own personal use. It is rather difficult to produce proof as regards his son being a member of the HUF. Admittedly the applicant himself was a member of a Hindu undivided family and he had divided himself with his brother after partition and thereafter no partition was shown to have been effected between him and his son. Unless other circumstances are conducive and are brought out in evidence to indicate that the applicant was not living jointly with his son a legal presumption would arise that his son is a member of the Hindu undivided family along with his father. The enquiry officer has wholly misdirected himself in rejecting this item of property as one of the items of the applicant's income and thus fell into serious error. This amount is therefore, liable to be computed to the applicant's income.

Now coming to the assets:

The learned counsel for the applicant Sh. A.K. Behera strongly urges that several items were shown towards the assets without any material, but merely on conjectures and surmises. As seen in the table supra, the enquiry officer has shown five items towards his assets and they

OK

are, construction of houses, three shops, mortgage of house, purchase of plots for daughters and TV/Fridge and household items in all totalling to Rs.7,70,000/-. Now, let us examine each disputed item:

i. Construction of Houses:

The disciplinary authority has alleged that the costs of construction would be Rs.2 lacs and the same was accepted by the enquiry officer. The learned counsel contends that there is practically no evidence either by way of evaluation report or any other material support of the imputation of having spent an amount of Rs.two lacs on the construction of the houses. A perusal of the enquiry officer's report in this regard, however, shows that the burden of proof was placed on the applicant, that he had not placed any material in support of his plea that it was a joint family property. To that extent we cannot interfere with this finding. But what is troubling us is how the enquiry officer arrived at the figure of Rs.2 lacs on the construction of the house. We do not find any material, oral or documentary, on the basis of which such estimate could have been made. No property valuer report nor any oral evidence estimating the value of the property was placed on record. In the absence of such material is it permissible for the enquiry officer to draw such inference? The enquiry officer has stated that the house was a large sized construction but even this was not supported by any material such as plinth area of the house, number of house, nature of construction etc. In the absence of such evidence the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that the estimate was based upon

conjectures appears to have force. We are aware that in the exercise of judicial review jurisdiction it is not permissible for us to enter into the validity of the findings if there is any evidence on record. But in the instant case as there is no evidence whatsoever on the basis of which the finding was arrived at we hold that this item cannot be accepted.

The next item is with regard to the construction of shops in plot No.242/2, Delhi, Gurgaon Road. The imputation is that he has spent Rs.30,000/- for shops which has been accepted by the enquiry officer, though it is denied. The case of the applicant is that the shops have been part of the family property, but no material was produced in support of his explanation. Hence it was rightly rejected. However, to arrive at the amount of Rs.30,000/-, as stated in the preceding paragraph, the enquiry officer has not based his conclusions on any material. The approximate period during which the shops were alleged to have been constructed, their plinth area the nature of construction or the nature of the roof, etc. were not kept in mind while making the estimate. For the reasons shown in the proceeding paragraph this amount also cannot be accepted.

ii. The next item of alleged asset is mortgage of the house by the applicant's wife for Rs.4 lacs. This item has been accepted by the enquiry officer though denied by the applicant. It is sought to be explained by him that the house was mortgage by his wife for the sum lent by her taking the amount on loan from her husband and from her friends. The house was owned by K.N. Sehgal and the

mortgage deed was Exhibit D-7. Subsequently, the mortgage was re-deemed on receipt of Rs.4 lacs which was deposited in the State Bank pass book Ex. S-3 E and this was intimated to the Assistant Director Income Tax Ex-S-2 (J). Thus, it was stated that the applicant never purchased that house and this cannot be included in his assets. The enquiry officer considering the evidence held that the Rule 18 (3) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules has been violated inasmuch as the mortgage was not brought to the notice of the department. Certain amounts which have been taken on loan from private parties was not believed. But it should not be forgotten that the applicant's wife had proved mortgage by the mortgage deed Exhibit D.7 and the mortgage was subsequently released and the amount was deposited in the State Bank, pass book Exhibit S.3-E. This evidence would clinch the allegation that it was only a mortgage and not the purchase of the house in the name of his wife. It is, therefore, not possible for us to accept the house as one of the assets of the applicant. No doubt, it is true that the applicant had violated Rule 18 (3) of the Rules but he is liable for not intimating the Government as per the Rules. But to take this aspect into consideration to disprove the existence of Mortgage is wholly arbitrary.

The amount of Rs.4 lacs is explained as under:

- | | | |
|------------|---|------------|
| 1. 2.12.90 | From Sh. S.B. Sharma (husband) | 1,00,000/- |
| 22.12.90 | He received as advance of Rs.82,000/- for an Agricultural Land situated at Village Chillar Ten & Distt. Rewari. | 82,000/- |
| 9.2.91 | Sh. S.B. Sharma (Husband) received an advance of Rs.1,50,000/- for an agreement for ancestral plot from Sh. Sube Singh S/o Sh Maru Ram, R/o Village Dundahers | 50,000/- |

20.2.91	-do-	32,000/
24.3.91	-do-	89,000/
2. 7.12.90	From Smt. Sumitra Devi w/o Sh.R.P. Yadav, Retd. Sub Major from Indian Army.	19,000/
3. 22.12.90	From Sh. Kailash Chander a real brother of my husband.	19,000/
4. 34.1.91	From Shri R.P. Yadava (Retd Sub Major) R/o Village Wazirabad.	4,000/
9.2.91	-do-	4,000/-
11.3.91	-do-	3,600\$
5.	Self past savings	4,650/
	Total	<u>4,07,250/-</u>

From this it is clear that an amount of Rs. one lac was taken from her husband and an amount of Rs.82,000/- was shown as the agricultural land income. The applicant also has given Rs.1,50,000 from the amount received as an advance against the agreement of sale from Sube Singh which has been forfeited. In the preceding paragraphs we have accepted this amount as the legitimate income of the applicant. Thus, Rs.3,32,000/- has been explained by the applicant. The remaining amount of Rs.78,000/- was also stated as having taken on loan from private parties. Even assuming that the said amount of Rs.78,000/- was not properly explained, the existence of mortgage itself cannot be denied and as it has been redeemed it should not have been treated as one of the assets of the applicant.

iii. The next asset is purchase of plots: The imputation is that the applicant purchased for 40,000/- two plots for the benefit of his daughters and the same has been accepted by the enquiry officer. The applicant denied having made any payment for purchase of the plots which belong to Shiv Akansa Housing Society. The enquiry officer

27

in fact found that there was no evidence in support of this imputation. In fact the allegation was that his son-in-law, the husband of daughter Rita paid money in the name of his (applicant's) other daughters Meena and Veena for two plots. It was not shown that the other daughters are members of the cooperative society. No evidence was also produced to show that the amount was actually received by the cooperative society for the purpose of these plots in the name of his daughters. In the absence of any material the enquiry officer accepted the imputation on the ground of pre-ponderance of probabilities which we find is wholly baseless and unsustainable. The findings were drawn on mere conjectures and in the absence of any material on record the question of pre-ponderance of probabilities would not arise. They would only amount to suspicions. Thus the two plots also cannot be stated to be an asset of the applicant.

iv. The last item refers to TV/Fridge and household items estimated at Rs.2 lacs, which the enquiry officer estimated at Rs. one lac. The learned counsel for the applicant forcefully contends that no one had visited the house and estimated the value of household articles and the estimate of Rs. two lacs is totally arbitrary. No material was placed in support of this contention either. The enquiry officer estimated the total value of Fridge, Scooter TV and other items at Rs.64,707/- as against Rs.50,000/- accepted by the applicant. Having gone into the discussion of the enquiry officer on this item, we are satisfied that his findings cannot be interfered with by us in this OA.

OK

28

Next head is Expenditure

(i) Regarding the expenditure incurred on the marriages of the applicants daughters. We have perused the discussion of the enquiry officer on the two items and we are satisfied that the same has been estimated on the basis of the material available on record. None of the contentions of the learned counsel on these items can be accepted.

Other items are not disputed.

16. From the foregoing discussion what emerges is as under:

Income

The income for a period of 12 years was not computed. Hence the amount shown against pay and allowances is held as arbitrary.

Rs.1,50,000/- advance from Sh. Sube Singh should be included in the income.

Rs.2,38,792/- son's income also to be included.

Assets

Construction of Houses: Rs.2,00,000/- shown not accepted.

Construction of Shops: Rs.30,000/- shown not accepted.

Purchase of House: Rs.4,00,000/- shown as an asset was held as mortgage, hence not accepted

Purchase of plots for daughter: Rs.40,000/- not accepted.

Thus, we do not find any disproportionate income or assets and the charge against the applicant in this regard is not proved.

17. Violation of Rule 18 of the CCS (Conduct) Rules:

As regards the filing of the returns of his immovable property as required under 18 (2) of the Rules, the enquiry officer has stated that the applicant was guilty of not intimating the sale of house at Gurgaon, transaction of 1,50,000 with Sube Singh and plots in the name of daughters, transaction of Rs.50,000/- with Vijay Singh and mortgage of the house. Regarding the transaction of Rs.1,50,000 with Sube Singh we have held that the amount has been forfeited on account of the agreement of sale having not been completed. Regarding two plots in the name of the daughter the same has not been accepted by us. Other items except sale of the house at Gurgaon are only private loans taken from the applicant's funds and the amount also was not substantial. He should, however, have intimated about the sale of the house at Gurgaon. But under Rule 9 of the CCS (Pension) Rules, unless the pensioner was found guilty of "grave misconduct or negligence during the period of service", the pension is not liable to be withdrawn. Thus, unless it is found that the applicant was guilty of grave misconduct or negligence no action can be taken by the President as regards his pension. In the present case the entire pension of the applicant has been withdrawn. Even assuming that the applicant is guilty of not intimating the Government, we

OK

30

find it rather difficult to hold that such non-intimation of a single item of sale of his house could be treated as grave misconduct or negligence within the definition of Rule 9 of the Pension Rules, so as to withdraw or withhold the pension of the applicant. We are, therefore, of the view that we find it difficult to sustain the impugned order, in its entirety.

18. In the result the OA succeeds. The impugned order is quashed. The respondents shall pay the pension and all other benefits due to the applicant, with interest at the rate of 15% p.a. from the date the amounts are due. These amounts shall be paid within a period of three months from date. The OA is accordingly allowed with costs of Rs.10,000/-.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (Admin)

'San.'

(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
Vice-Chairman (J)