

Open Court

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

(This the 4<sup>th</sup> Day of November, 2020)

**Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Vijay Lakshmi, Member (Judicial)**

**Original Application No.330/614/2020**

Baijnath Prasad a/a 64 years s/o Shri Shivnath Prasad R/o Village house No.720, Near Power House, Ratsar Kalan, District Ballia, U.P., Pin Code No.277123.

..... **Applicant**

**By Advocate: Shri O.P. Ojha**

Versus

1. Union of India through its G.M.,/ Northern Railway/Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, New Delhi.
3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, Northern Railway, New Delhi.
4. Sr. DFM/Northern Railway, New Delhi.

..... **Respondents**

**By Advocate: Shri G.K. Tripathi**

**O R D E R**

**Delivered by Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Vijay Lakshmi, Member (Judicial)**

Shri O.P. Ojha, Advocate has appeared on behalf of applicant. Shri G.K. Tripathi, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondents, on advance notice.

2. Heard on admission and perused the record.
3. The applicant retired as Fitter (M.C.M.) on reaching the age of superannuation on 13.12.2016 after completing 33 years of continuous service in the respondents' establishment. At the time of his retirement he was getting the salary of Rs.47,600/- p.m. as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. In support, the applicant has filed salary slips of

October, November and December, 2016 collectively as Annexure A-2.

4. The grievance of the applicant is that in the PPO (Pension Payment Order) issued to him on 10.01.2017, the last pay drawn by him was wrongly mentioned as Rs.42,800/- and accordingly his pension was also wrongly calculated as Rs.21,400/- and he was not found eligible for medical allowances.

5. The, further, grievance of the applicant is that though he had made several representations since 17.03.2017 to 20.07.2018, but no order was passed by the respondents on any of his representations.

6. In the aforesaid factual background, the learned counsel for the applicant has prayed that the applicant is ready to prefer a fresh representation and he will be happy and satisfied if the respondent concerned, who is the competent authority, is directed to decide it by passing a detailed, reasoned and speaking order in a time bound manner.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents has no objection against the aforesaid limited prayer made by learned counsel for the applicant.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, no fruitful purpose will be served in keeping this matter pending and it is disposed of finally with following directions to the parties:-

- (i) The applicant shall prefer a detailed representation ventilating his grievance annexing his pay slips (Annexure A-2 in this OA) before the concerned respondent, who is the competent authority, within a period of two weeks, along with a certified copy of this order.
- (ii) The respondent concerned, who is the competent authority, on receipt of such representation shall pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of representation submitted by the applicant.
- (iii) The order so passed on the representation of the applicant shall be communicated to him without any delay.

9. With the aforesaid directions, the OA is finally disposed of at the admission stage.

10. It is made clear that the Tribunal has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

11. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Justice Vijay Lakshmi  
Member (J))**

**Sushil**