

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No.849/96

New Delhi, this the 8th August 1997.

Hon'ble Dr. Jose P. Verghese, Vice-Chairman(J)

P. Ganapathi Swamy,
Deputy Director (Vigilance)
Employees' State Insurance Corporation,
'Panchdeep Bhawan', Kotla Road,
New Delhi.

....Applicant.

(Applicant in person)

versus

Union of India through

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block, Central Secretariat,
New Delhi.
2. Director General,
Central Industrial Security Force,
Block No. 13, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi.
3. The Pay and Accounts Officer,
Central Industrial Security Force,
Block No. 13, CGO Complex,
New Delhi.
4. Employees' State Insurance Corporation,
(To be represented by its Director General)
'Panchdeep Bhawan', Kotla Road,
New Delhi.

....Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri M.K.Gupta)

O R D E R (Oral)

[Dr. Jose P. Verghese, Vice-Chairman (J)]

The petitioner in this case is seeking a direction that the payment of six days which was already paid by the respondents amounting to Rs. 267, has not been

paid with interest as according to him, the payment was made after eleven years. Similarly Rs. 920/- was given to him as due to him under Group Insurance Scheme and he is claiming interest on the said amount as well, on the ground that the same has also been paid after eleven years.

The counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, on the other hand, brought to our notice an order of this court passed in OA No. 1904/94 on 14th November, 1995 in which this court had finally settled the matter between the parties and had directed the respondents no. 2 to consider counting of the service rendered by the applicant under respondent no. 3 and pass a suitable order under intimation to the applicant within a further period of two months. The payment has been made to the petitioner in accordance with this order and in the absence of an order contained in the said final order dated 14 November, 1995 for payment of arrears, we are afraid that no further arrears can be directed to be given in this regard. The petitioner further claims that he is entitled to encash the entire amount of earned leave amounting to the leave salary equivalent to that of 180 days' pay. According to him he was entitled to this leave account to be forwarded to respondent no. 3 at the time he left the job with respondent no. 2. Counsel for the respondents states that even if the said earned leave account is forwarded to respondent no. 3 at present, the petitioner will stand to benefit nothing in view of the fact that he has already

encashed the maximum days of earned leave namely 240 days with the respondent no. 3.

In view of this, no other issue remains to be resolved in this OA. Hence, this OA is disposed of with no order as to costs.

(Dr. Jose P. Verghese)
Vice-Chairman(J)