



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**CHANDIGARH BENCH**

O.A.NO.060/00977/2020

Decided on: 16.12.2020

**HON'BLE MS. AJANTA DAYALAN, MEMBER (A)**

Smt. Sunita Walia

W/o Shri Amarpal Singh Walia,

Aged 61 years,

Postal Assistant, Group 'C' (Retired),

Resident of # 264, 'I' Block BRS Nagar,

Ludhiana-141001.

....

Applicant

**(BY ADVOCATE: MR. MANOHAR LAL)**

VERSUS

1. Union of India through Secretary,

Ministry of Telecommunication and Information Technology,

Department of Posts,

Dak Bhawan,

New Delhi-110001.

2. Senior superintendent of Posts, City Division Ludhiana-  
141001.

Respondents

**(BY ADVOCATE: MR. SANJAY GOYAL)**



**O R D E R (ORAL)**  
**HON'BLE MS. AJANTA DAYALAN, MEMBER (A)**

1. Applicant lays challenge to order dated 22.3.2019 (Annexure A-1) whereby her claim for medical reimbursement of Rs.2,85,438/- for medical treatment of her husband taken from DMCH, Ludhiana, has been rejected, on the ground that retirees are not covered under CS (MA) Rules, 1944 etc.
2. Heard via video conferencing.
3. Learned counsel vehemently argued that the view taken by the respondents to reject the claim of the applicant on the plea that the retirees are not entitled to medical benefits under CS (MA) Rules, 1944, is contrary to the law settled by this Court, which was further upheld by the Hon'ble High Court in the case of **UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS VS. MOHAN LAL GUPTA & ANOTHER**, 2018 (1) SCT 687, and a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **SHIVA KANT JHA VS. UNION OF INDIA** (2018(2) SCT 529). He further argued that a number of similar OAs filed against the same department have been allowed and despite that the respondents have taken the same view that the retirees are not covered under CS (MA) Rules, 1944. He, therefore, prayed that the impugned order be quashed and the respondents be directed to reimburse the amount incurred by the applicant on treatment of her husband.
4. Issue notice.
5. At this stage, Mr. Sanjay Goyal, Sr. CGSC, appears and accepts notice. He is not in a position to support the impugned



order or cite any law contrary to what has been argued by learned counsel for applicant.

6. Since the plea taken by the respondents while passing the impugned order has already been negated by the Court of law in a number of cases, the impugned order dated 22.3.2019 (Annexure A-1) is quashed and set aside. The matter is remitted back to the respondents to re-appreciate the claim of the applicant and reimburse the genuine and admissible amount as per rules and instructions but in the light of judicial pronouncement in the case of Mohan Lal Gupta (supra), within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. No costs.

**(AJANTA DAYALAN)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

Place: Chandigarh  
Dated: 16.12.2020

HC\*