

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/020/168/2021**

HYDERABAD, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021

**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member**  
**Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**



1. Smt Bakka Nagaratnam,  
W/o. B. Nooka Raju (Late),  
Aged about 65 years, Occ: Retd. HS-I,  
PPO No. C/NAVY/17856/2014,  
Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam,  
R/o. D.No.1-88/2, PM Palem, Carshed,  
Visakhapatnam – 530 041.
2. Smt Chintala Varalakshmi,  
W/o. Chintala Appala Raju (Late),  
Aged about 64 years,  
Occ: Retd. Master Craftsman,  
PPO No. C/NAVY/10417/2016,  
Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam,  
R/o. D.No.4-131, Kothapalem,  
Gopalapatnam, Visakhapatnam – 530 027.
3. Smt Molleti Sarada,  
W/o. Molleti Appa Rao (Late),  
Aged about 67 years, Occ: Retd. Highly Skilled,  
PPO No. C/NAVY/16452/2013, Naval Dockyard,  
Visakhapatnam, R/o. D.No.44-29-1,  
Dhobi Street, Railway New Colony,  
Visakhapatnam – 530 016.

...Applicants

(By Advocate : Sri KRKV. Prasad)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by  
The Secretary, Ministry of Defence,  
Government of India, South Block,  
New Delhi.
2. The Chief of Naval Staff,  
Integrated Headquarters,  
MoD (Navy), New Delhi – 110 011.

3. The Flag Officer, Commanding-in- Chief,  
Head Quarters, Eastern Naval Command,  
Visakhapatnam.
4. The Admiral Superintendent,  
Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam.
5. The Secretary, Government of India,  
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions,  
Department of Personnel & Training,  
North Block, New Delhi – 110 001.
6. The Ministry of Finance rep. by  
The Secretary, Government of India,  
Department of Expenditure,  
North Block, New Delhi.



....Respondents

(By Advocate : Sri B. Madhusudhan Reddy, Sr. PC for CG)

---

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Administrative Member)**

**Through Video Conferencing:**



2. The OA is filed in regard to grant of notional increment to the applicants which fell due on a date subsequent to their dates of retirement.

3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicants retired on 30<sup>th</sup> June of different years. As the applicants retired the day before the due date of increment, they have not been sanctioned the increment citing the reason that they were not in service on the date of the increment. Applicants represented seeking the said benefit and the same has been turned down. Hence, the OA is filed.

4. The contentions of the applicants are that the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No. 15732 of 2017 vide order dt. 15.09.2017 has granted the relief sought, which has attained finality and as the applicants are similarly placed, they need to be granted the relief sought. They also cited orders of this Tribunal.

5. Heard both the counsel and perused the pleadings on record.

6. A similar issue fell for consideration by this Tribunal in OA No.538/2020, which was disposed of on 26.08.2020 with a direction to the respondents therein to grant the benefit. Similar OAs were also disposed of by this Tribunal on the same lines. On being challenged in the Hon'ble

High Court of Telangana in WP No.20907/2020 & Batch, orders of the Tribunal have been suspended by the Hon'ble High Court on 03.12.2020. In view of the above development, the respondents are directed to consider grant of relief sought by the applicants depending on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court on the issue, as and when it is delivered.



7. With the above direction, the OA is disposed of at the admission stage, with no order as to costs.

**(B.V.SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

/evr/