

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**



**O.A. No.272/2021
MA No. 328/2021**

This the 9th day of February, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Bishnoi, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J)**

Shri Anil Pal
S/o Shri Baljeet,
Aged 27 year,
Group D
R/o Near Jeet Puri Mandir,
Pal Chopal, Gauhranda,
Distt- Karnal
Haryana

... Applicant

(through Advocate Shri Manjeet Singh Reen)

Versus

Ministry of Railways & others

1. The Secretary,
Ministry of Railways,
Rail Bhawan,
Railway Board,
New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House,
New Delhi.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Northern Railway,
State Entry Road,
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(through Advocate: Shri Krishan Kant Sharma)

ORDER (Oral)**Hon'ble Mr. R. N. Singh, Member (J):**

- 1) The applicant's father herein had applied under the 1st cycle of 25.1.2016, under a Scheme known as Liberalized Active Retirement Scheme for Guaranteed Employment for Safety Staff (LARSGESS), which was in force at that time, seeking his voluntary retirement and appointment of his son in his place. The medical examination of the applicant was done and he was declared Fit.
- 2) It is submitted that the said Scheme of LARSGESS was also put on hold w.e.f. 27.10.2017 because of certain judicial pronouncements and this may have been the reason why Respondents awaited for clarification from Railway Board. The scheme was finally terminated also vide circular Dt 5.3.2019. However, in respect of cases pending as of 27.10.2017, the matter was adjudicated by Hon'ble Apex Court vide their judgement Dt 26.3.2019 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 219 of 2019, Narinder Siraswal and Ors Vs UOI and Anr, wherein certain directions were passed. The operative para reads as under:

“ xxxxx

Since the petitioners are claiming benefit under the scheme which was prevalent when applications were



preferred by the petitioners, we give liberty to the petitioners to approach the concerned authorities with appropriate representations. If such representation is made, the authorities will do well to consider the matter within two weeks on preferring of the representations.

With these observations, the writ petition stands disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

- 3) Since he satisfied the conditions when the LARSGESS scheme was still applicable and his son was not granted appointment, and his case is covered under the Hon'ble Apex Court judgement (Para 2 supra), he has now preferred a representation for appointment of his son under LARSGESS on 24.12.2020, which has not been decided as yet. Feeling aggrieved, the instant OA has been filed.
- 4) The matter has been heard. Issue Notice.
- 5) Shri K. K. Sharma, learned counsel appears on behalf of Respondents, on advance information, and accepts notice.
- 6) At this stage, learned counsel for the applicant submits that they would be satisfied if the respondents decide their pending representation dated 24.12.2020 by passing a reasoned and speaking order in terms of Hon'ble Apex Court Judgment dated 26.03.2019 (Para 2 supra).
- 7) The OA is disposed of at the admission stage itself, without going into the merits of the case, with a direction to the respondents to pass a reasoned and speaking order on the



pending representation dated 24.12.2020, keeping into account the Hon'ble Apex Court's direction dated 26.03.2019. This exercise shall be completed within a period of 4 weeks and the decision so taken shall be advised to the applicants within this time.

8) Pending MA No.328/2021 also stands disposed of.

(R.N. Singh)
Member (J)

(A. K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

/dkm/anjali/daya/