

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/21/598/2020**

HYDERABAD, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2020



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

M. Venkateswarlu,  
S/o. Sri Mallaiah,  
Aged about 62 years,  
Retired Sr. Technician,  
Group C Employee,  
South Central Railway,  
Secunderabad Division,  
H.No. 4-6-32/53/2, Baba Nagar,  
Nacharam, Hyderabad – 500 076, TS.

...      **Applicant**

(By Advocate: Mr. S. Srinivasa Rao)

**Vs.**

1. Union of India rep. by its General Manager, South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad – 500 025, TS.
2. The Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, South Central Railway, Secunderabad Division, Sanchalan Bhavan, Secunderabad – 500 025, TS.

...      **Respondents**

(By Advocate: Mr. N. Srinivasa Rao, SC for Rlys.)

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

**Through Video Conferencing:**



2. The O.A. has been filed aggrieved by the action of the respondents in recovering a sum of Rs.15,771/- from the settlement dues of the applicant.
3. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant retired as Sr. Technician from the respondent's organization on 30.04.2017. After his retirement, the respondents recovered an amount of Rs.15,771/- from his settlement dues. The applicant represented to the respondents on 4.4.2019 and followed it by another representation on 6.6.2019 stating that the recovery made from his settlement dues is incorrect and impermissible under law as well as the instructions of the Railway Board. The respondents have not taken any action on the representations and, therefore, the O.A.
4. The contentions of the applicant are that recovery made is against the orders of the Railway Board bearing the No.72/2016 dated 22.6.2016 and DOPT orders vide O.M. dated 02.3.2016. Besides, as per the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Punjab & Others vs Rafiq Masih & Others**, no recovery should be made from Group 'C' & Group 'D' employees under certain conditions. The case of the applicant is fully covered by the said judgement.
5. Heard Sri S. Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N. Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the respondents, and perused the pleadings on record.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be a stylized 'S' or a similar mark.

6. The dispute is about the recovery made from the settlement dues of the applicant on his retirement. Applicant states that his case is covered by the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rafiq Masih's case, respondents instructions and DOPT memo cited supra. The contention of <sup>applicant</sup> the is that since his case is fully covered by the instructions of the Railway Board and that of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the action of the respondents in recovering a sum of Rs.15,771/- is illegal. Therefore, he made representations on 4.4.2019 & 6.6.2019. The respondents have not disposed of the same. In view of the above, the respondents are directed to dispose of the representations of the applicant within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order, based on the relevant rules and in accordance with law by issuing a reasoned and speaking order.

With the above direction, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage. No order as to costs.

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

**(ASHISH KALIA)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

/pv/