

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.227 of 1996

New Delhi, this the 2nd day of June, 1997.

Hon'ble Mr. N. Sahu, Member(A)

G.S. Mahey,  
R/o 433/S-7,  
R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi (Retired Research  
Officer from Ministry of Defence) ...Applicant  
(None for the applicant)

Versus

1. Union of India  
through  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi-DHQ-110 011
2. Joint Secretary(Trg) and  
Chief Administrative Officer  
C-II Hutmants,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi - 110 011 ..Respondents

(By Shri J.S. Joshi, Director(J) Office of  
Joint Secretary(Trg) and Chief Administrative  
Officer - Ministry of Defence - Presenting Officer)

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. N. Sahu, Member(A)

This application is directed against  
deduction of sum of Rs.180/- from the final LTC claim  
made in the month of February, 1995.

2. The brief facts are that the applicant had taken an advance of Rs.5,000/- and completed journey to Amritsar. He refunded the balance amount of Rs.3,924/- by MRO in Reserve Bank and submitted a final LTC claim of Rs.1,176/- to respondent No.2. The applicant travelled onward by train and backward partly by bus and partly by train. He spent Rs.498/-

*Presenting*

(A)

on railway fare for onward journey and Rs.678/- towards bus fare and rail fare for return journey. A sum of Rs.180/- was deducted from the claim, reasons for which are explained in a letter dated 5.12.1996 addressed by the respondents to the applicant. The respondents state that the return journey was performed by a longer route and the distances were not indicated and as such claim was restricted to Rs.498/-. In the said letter dated 5.12.1996 it is stated that reimbursement of expenses for the return journey from Amritsar to Ambala would be allowed to the extent of rail sleeper class fare and from Ambala to New Delhi by Shatabadi AC Chair Car thereby allowing a total amount of Rs.550/-. To this extent deduction of Rs.180/- is reduced by Rs.52/- by virtue of this letter dated 5.12.1996. The objections of the applicant against this procedure, elaborated by him in the rejoinder, are not convincing. If the applicant had travelled by bus he could claim either the bus fare by the shortest route or the equivalent sleeper class railway fare. Since the bus route is stated to be a longer route the respondents are justified in limiting the claim to sleeper class fare of the Railway. There is no merit in this OA and it is accordingly dismissed. The parties shall bear their own costs.

N. Sahu  
( N.SAHU )  
Member(A)