

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/020/852/2020

HYDERABAD, this the 11th day of November, 2020



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

1. K.Durga Prasad, S/o.Nagalingaiah,
Aged about 62 years, Occ: Sr. Record Sorter (Retired),
PPO No.20187090700450,
R/o. 13-48, Near Water Tank,
Revenue Ward No.13, Tadepalli,
Guntur Dist, Andhra Pradesh
2. Dasi Adishesha Rao, S/o.D.Nagaiah,
Aged about 64 years, Occ: Account Assistant (Retired)
PPO No.20167090700581,
R/o. 21-10-4/25, 4th Lane, Srinagar,
S.N.Puram, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
3. V.Aseervadam, S/o.V.Raghavelu,
Aged about 62 years, Occ: Account Assistant (Retired)
PPO No.20187090700377,
R/o. 21-11-54/B, Lecturers Colony, II Lane,
Madhura Nagar, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
4. Vuddagiri H.C.B.V.Prasad, S/o.V.U.Bhaskara Rao,
Aged about 62 years, Occ: Senior Engineer (Retired),
PPO No.20187090700420,
R/o. 21-9/3-4/2, 3rd Lane, Pasuputhota,
Madhura Nagar, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
5. S.Srinivasa Rao, S/o.S.Srihari Rao,
PPO No.20177090700550
Aged about 63 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retired)
R/o. H.No.20-8-2/5a, 6th Street, New Ayodhyanagar,
Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
6. Vummadi Kotaiah, S/o.V.Venkatappaiah,
Aged about 61 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retired),
PPO No.20197090700314,
R/o.A.P.H.B.Colony, HIG-202,
Bhavanipuram, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
7. A.Kameswara Rao S/o. A. Seshagiri Rao,
Aged about 63 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retired),
PPO No.20177090700539,
R/o.21-1-47,FF3, Pavan Sai Nilayam Apts,

A.S.Raju Road, Mutyalampadu, Vijayawada.A.P.



8. Y.H.V.Veera Brahma Prasad, S/o.Bhimabasavacharyulu ,
Aged about 64 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd),
PPO No.20167090700517,
R/o. 32-15-104, Flat No.G-1, Ratnamba Street,
Mogalrajapuram, Vijayawada. A.P
 9. K.Suresh S/o.K.Ananda Rao,
Aged about 60 years, Occ: Sr.Accounts Assistant (Retd)
PPO No.20207090700315,
R/o. H.No.18-110/1, Rakshana Nilayam,
Tulasi Nagar, 3rd Lane, Kanuru,
Krishna Dist, Andhra Pradesh
 10. Kota Paul, S/o.Nandeswara Rao,
Aged about 64 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd.)
PPO No.20167090700549,
R/o.D.No.42-2/1-173/3, Main Road,
DRWA-343,Devinagar, Vijayawada. A.P.
 11. Ch.Vimalakumari, W/o.S.Sunder Prasad,
Aged about 61 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd.)
PPO No.20197090700361,
R/o.H.No.1-4/8-22/5, Brahmaiah Vigna,
Flat No.502,Hartha Apts, Kamakoti Nagar,
Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
 12. Pasupuleti Nagaraja Kumari, D/o.P.Krishna Murthy,
Aged about 65 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd)
PPO No.20157090700301,
R/o. D.No. 7-15, Near Vura Cheruvu,
Kattevaram (Post), Tenali, Andhra Pradesh.
 13. R.Venkat, S/o.Venkaiah,
Aged about 60 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd.)
PPO No.20207090700298,
R/o.H.No.2-8,Bandaru Manyam,
Chinna Paduguppadu, Nellore Dist, A.P.
 14. K.Sudhakar, S/o.Syamala Rao,
Aged about 67 years, Occ:Accounts Assistant (Retd.)
PPO No.20137090700300,
R/o.F1-201, SF2, Lakshmi Residency,
Near Pipula Road, Vijayawada, A.P.
 15. M.S.Srinivas, S/o M.S.R.Acharyulu,
Aged about 60 years, Occ: Accounts Assistant (Retd),
PPO No.20207090700306,
R/o Flat No.118, Sri Sai Balaji Enclave,
Nunna, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh.
- ...Applicants

(By Advocate : Mr.M.C.Jacob)

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Represented by the Secretary,
Railway Board, Ministry of Railways,
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi
2. The General Manager,
South Central Railways, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad
3. The Senior Divisional Financial Manager,
South Central Railway, Vijayawada Division,
Vijayawada, Krishna Dist, Andhra Pradesh

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr.S.M.Patnaik, SC for Railways)



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

Through Video Conferencing:



2. This OA is filed for grant of notional increment due on 1st July of the year of retirement after having retired from service on the 30th June of the relevant year with consequential benefits.

3. The applicants retired from service on 30th of June of respective years of retirement. The grievance of the applicants is that they were supposed to be granted increment due on 1st of July of the relevant year for having worked for one year prior to their retirement. They relied upon the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in WP No.15732/2017 dt.15.09.2017, which has attained finality. They also cited orders of various courts in support of their claim. The applicants contend that despite making representations to the authorities, the said benefits have not been granted to them. Aggrieved, the OA has been filed.

4. Heard both sides counsel and perused the material on record.

5. Learned counsel for the applicants pleaded that in similar cases, this Tribunal passed orders against the same respondents and therefore, the applicants are entitled for similar relief.

6. This Tribunal granted similar relief in several OAs. In OA Nos.1263/2018 and 1155/2018, this Tribunal passed elaborate orders discussing the issue on hand threadbare. Recently, on 17.07.2020, in OA Nos. 325/2020 & Batch, this Tribunal passed a detailed order while advertng to the averments and contentions of the respondents therein.



“XVIII) Further, the Hon’ble Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal in OA No.180/1055/2018 and batch, vide order dt.03.12.2019, extended the same relief as sought by the applicants by opining as under:

“9. We find that the Hon’ble Madras High Court had already considered the issue raised by the applicants in the present OAs, we are in full agreement with the judgment passed by the Hon’ble Madras High Court in P. Ayyamperumal’s case (supra) upheld by the Hon’ble apex court.

10. Therefore, the impugned orders of rejection Annexure A4 in OA No. 180/654/2019 and Annexures A5 in OAs Nos. 180/1055/2018 and 180/61/2019 are quashed and set aside. The applicant in OA No. 180/109/2019 had sought relief to quash Annexure A6 which is only a reply to the question posed by a Member of Parliament in Lok Sabha. The applicants shall be given one notional increment for the purpose of calculating the pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose as held by the Hon’ble Madras High Court in P. Ayyamperumal’s case (supra) upheld by the Hon’ble apex court. The respondents shall implement the order of this Tribunal within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.”

It is the cardinal principle of judicial discipline, as held by the Apex Court in the case of S.I. Rooplal vs Lt. Governor of Delhi¹ that precedents are to be strictly adhered to.

Xxxx

XIX. Respondents banking on the fact that the Hon’ble Madras Bench of this Tribunal has dismissed OAs 1710 to 1714/2018, 309/2019, 312/2019, 26/2019, 498/2019 and MA 226/2019 filed seeking similar relief in March and April 2019, urged that the instant OAs be dismissed. However, in the context of the Hon’ble Supreme Court dismissing the relevant SLP and Review Petition cited supra and in the context of the observation at para XVI above in regard to review of P. Ayyamperumal judgment, as well as the later judgments of the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi on 23.01.2020 plus that of the Hon’ble Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal on 3.12.2019, which are later to the Hon’ble Madras Tribunal Bench orders, it is incumbent on the respondents to grant the increment on 1st July. Respondents did point out that even this Tribunal has also dismissed OA 1275/2013 on 20.6.2019 seeking the relief sought. However, it is to be observed that as on 20.6.2019, the dismissal decision of Hon’ble Apex Court in the Review Petition delivered on 8.8.2019 filed against P. Ayyamperumal verdict was obviously not available and therefore, the dismissal. Subsequently, this Tribunal, in the light of the dismissal of the review petition referred to, disposed of OA Nos.1263/2018, 1155/2018 & 229/2020 on 13.03.2020; OA No.430/2020 on 26.06.2020 & OA Nos. 431/2020 & 432/2020 on 08.07.2020. In addition, keeping in view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble

¹ (2000) 1 SCC 644

Apex Court in **Roop Lal**, to abide by the precedent, the respondents cannot afford to take any other view but are bound by the latest judgments of the superior judicial forums referred to above.

xxxx xxxx

XXIII) Now coming to the aspect of DA on 1st July consequent to retirement of an employee, the matter is under adjudication by the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP No.5646 of 2018 and 5647 of 2018 and therefore, applicants can pursue for appropriate remedies from the respondents based on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the issue.



XXIV. In view of the aforesaid, it is evident that the respondents have transgressed the rules and laws related to the issue adjudicated upon. Therefore, the OAs fully succeed. Hence, there can be no better conclusion other than to direct the respondents to consider as under:

i) Re-fix the pension of applicants by allowing the eligible increment for rendering an year of service due on 1st July.

ii) Release pension and pensionary benefits with all consequential benefits thereof, based on (i) above.

iii) While releasing benefits as at (ii) above, in regard to the quantum of arrears to be released, the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in *Union of India & Ors Vs. Tarsem Singh* in Civil Appeal Nos. 5151-5152 of 2008 vide para 5, has to be borne in mind and followed.

iv) Time calendared to implement the judgment is 3 months from the date of receipt of this order.

XXV. With the above directions, the OAs are allowed to the extent stated above."

Further, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P (C) 10509/2019 in *Gopal Singh v U.O.I* has also granted a similar relief on 23.01.2020, as under:

"10. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 3rd May, 2019 is set aside. A direction is issued to the Respondents to grant notional increment to the Petitioner with effect from 1st July, 2019. The Petitioner's pension will consequentially be re-fixed...."

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the SLP (Civil)... Diary No. 13959/2020 filed against the judgment and order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P (C) 10509/2019 dt. 23.01.2020, has been dismissed on 13.10.2020 and the order of the Hon'ble High Court granting similar relief, as sought in this OA, has become final. The order of the Hon'ble Supreme

Court is also filed along with the OA. Operative portion of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reads thus:

“Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and carefully perused the record.

Delay condoned.

We see no reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the High Court.

The Special Leave petition is, accordingly, dismissed.”



Applicants also stated in the OA that in the affidavit filed in support of the SLP filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court challenging the judgment and order dt. 20.09.2012 in WA No. 1940/2012 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the State of Tamil Nadu v. M. Balasubramaniam, the State of Tamil Nadu raised a specific question of law in Para N and also Para (xiii) in grounds referring to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in the case of Principal Accountant General & Anr v. C. Subba Rao. Thus, the learned counsel for the applicants argues that the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of AP was also brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Supreme Court by the State of Tamil Nadu while filing the above SLP. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the SLP Diary Order No.11662/2013 on 08.07.2013.

According to the applicants, they submitted representations to the respondents on 06.10.2020 and the same are pending consideration by the respondents.

7. However, before the signing the judgment, we were informed that the Hon'ble High Court of Telangana in WP No. 20907/2020 & batch, vide order dt. 03.12.2020, granted an interim suspension of the order of this Tribunal in OA 538/2020 and similar cases. Therefore, respondents are directed to provide relief based on the decision of the Hon'ble High Court as and when the WPs are decided.



With the above directions, the OA is disposed of, No order as to costs.

(B.V.SUDHAKAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

evr