

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/020/01127/2019

HYDERABAD, this the 21st day of October, 2020



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

1. U R Narasinga Rao, Age 63 years,
S/o Late U.Suryanarayana, Retired Steno,
O/o MOV, R/o D.No.13-3-16, Bhujanga Rao peta,
Maharanipeta (PO), Vizag-530002.
2. P.Mohan Rao, 63 years,
S/o Late P Veerabhadra Swamy,
Occ : Retired PS,O/o ND(V) R/o 22-62-2,
Gajula Street, Town Hall Road,Vizag-530001.
3. CL N Prasad, Age 62 yrs,
S/o Late C.Sita Ramaiah, Occ : Retired PS,
O/o HQENC(V), R/o H.No.21-68/12,
Doggawanipalem, Pendurthy,Vizag-531173.
4. R.Sanayasi Rao, Age 60 yrs, S/o Late R.Krishna Murthy,
Occ : Retd PS, O/o SBC(V), R/o H.No.306,
Madhav Dhara, Vizag-530007.
5. K K Satyanarayana, Age 71 yrs,
Occ : Retd P.S, S/o Late Appala Narasimhulu,
O/o SBC(V), R/o H.No.7-113, Chanakya Nagar,
Chinna Mushidiwada, Vizag-530051.
6. S Indira Kumari, Age 67 yrs, Occ : Retd SPS,
W/o S.S.Murthy, O/o SBC(V) R/o H.No.70-71,
Flat No.501, Sharma Gardens, Narasimha Nagar, Vizag.
7. Bolem Ramana, Age 67 yrs, S/o Late B Atchayya,
Occ : Retd Sr.Steno, O/o ND(V), R/o H.No.39-13-17,
Harsha Enclave, Murali Nagar, Vizag-530007.Applicants

(By Advocate : Mrs.Anita Swain)

Vs.

1. The Union of India,
Rep by its Secretary, Ministry of Defence,
South Block, New Delhi.



2. The Chief of Naval Staff, IHQ, MOD(Navy),
Integrated Headquarter, Sena Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. The Flag-Officer-Commanding-in-Chief,
Head Quarter, Eastern Naval Command,
Naval Base, Visakhapatnam,530014.
4. The Admiral Superintendent, Naval Dockyard,
Naval Base, Visakhapatnam.
5. The Project Director, Ship Building Centre,
Varuna Block, Visakhapatnam,530014.
6. The Material Superintendent,
For Controller (P&A), NAD, Eastern Naval
Command, Naval Dockyard,Visakhapatnam.
7. The Secretary,
Department of Personnel & Training,
Government of India, New Delhi.Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr.M. Brahma Reddy, Sr. PC for CG)

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 to the applicants on 1st July of different years of retirement having retired from service on the 30th June of the relevant year, with consequential benefits.
3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicants retired from the respondents organization on 30th June of different years viz., 2012, 2016, 2017 & 2019. The grievance of the applicants is that they were supposed to be granted increment due on 1st of July of the year of retirement, but they were not granted despite making representations. Aggrieved, the OA has been filed.
4. The contentions of the applicants are that they are entitled for the relief sought in the OA, basing upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in WP No. 15732/2017, which attained finality. They submitted representations from 04.10.2018 to 27.08.2019 and some of the representations were rejected. They contend that when one set of employees are extended the benefits, the same cannot be denied to other similarly placed employees as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Inder Pal Yadav v. Union of India, and K.C. Sharma v. Union of India.
5. The respondents filed reply statement opposing the OA .
6. Heard both the counsel and perused the material on record.

7(I) This Tribunal earlier granted similar relief in some OAs. In OA No.1155/2018, this Tribunal passed an elaborate order discussing the issue on hand threadbare and following the same, some other OAs were disposed.

Recently, on 17.07.2020, in OA Nos. 325/2020 & Batch, this Tribunal passed a detailed order on the same subject. Some of the observations, and the conclusions made in OA No. 325/2020 & batch, are as under:



“XVII. Continuing their defence, respondents have stated that the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in W.P (C) No. 9062/2018 & C.M No 34892/2018 has rejected similar relief in regard to increment and enhanced DA on 23.10.2018 even by referring to P. Ayyamperumal Judgment. However, the Hon’ble Delhi High Court in its later judgment in W.P (C) 10509/2019 in Gopal Singh v U.O.I did grant a similar relief on 23.01.2020, as under:

“8. More recently, this Court in its decision dated 13th January, 2020 in W.P.(C) 5539/2019 (Arun Chhibber v. Union of India) has discussed the judgment in P. Ayyamperumal at some length in the context of the prayer of an officer of the Central Reserve Police Force (‘CRPF’) who had retired on 30th June, 2007 for notional increment. The Court rejected the contention of the Respondents therein that the judgment in P. Ayyamperuamal had to be treated as one that was in personam and not in rem. In relation to the Respondent’s attempt to distinguish the applicability of the judgment in P. Ayyamperumal to CRPF personnel, the Court observed as under:-

*“5. The Court finds that the only difference, if any, between P. Ayyamperumal (*supra*) and this case is that the former was an employee of the Central Government, whereas here the Petitioner superannuated from the CRPF. The Court, therefore, finds no reasons to deny the Petitioner same relief granted to Mr. P. Ayyamperumal by the Madras High Court. The similarity in the two cases is that here too, the Petitioner has completed one year of service, just one day prior to 1st July, 2007.”*

9. The position here as regards CISF personnel can be no different and it was not, therefore, open to the Respondents to refuse to grant to the Petitioner notional increment merely because he superannuated a day earlier than the day fixed by the CPC for such benefit to accrue.

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. The appropriate orders will be issued and arrears of pension will be paid to the Petitioner within a period of 6 weeks, failing which

the Respondents would be liable to simple interest at 6% per annum on the arrears of period of delay.”

It requires no reiteration that the later judgment of Hon’ble High Court of Delhi on 13.1.2020 on the same issue holds the ground. It must be noted that the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi has rejected the contention that P.Ayyamperumal Judgment is in personam on which the respondents harped by stating that the nodal Ministry i.e. DOPT has taken such a stand. Moreover, the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Principal Accountant General, AP & others v C. Subba Rao & others in 2005(2) ALD 1 = 2005 (2) ALT 25 cited by the respondents to back their defence would not be relevant in view of the latest Judgment of the Hon’ble Delhi court on 23.1.2020 referred to above and the dismissal of both the SLP (C) No.22008/2018 plus the Review Petition vide RP (C) No.1731/2019 filed thereupon against Ayyamperumal judgment in WP No.15732/2017 dt. 15.9.2017, by the Hon’ble Apex Court on 23.7.2018 and 8.8.2019 respectively, for reasons expounded in para XVI. It is also pertinent to point out that when the C. Subba Rao judgment was delivered in 2005 by the Hon’ble High Court of A.P. the rule for granting increment was the date of joining of the service/ date of promotion. The rule has been changed after the 6th CPC with the date of increment being taken as a uniform date of 1st July and as per CCS revised pay rules of 2008 after completion of 6 months of service in the grade/pay scale, one would become eligible for grant of an increment. Moreover, the concept of taking 50% of last pay drawn for granting of pension has been brought into vogue from 2006 onwards. The change in the rules subsequent to C. Subba Rao judgment have made it irrelevant.

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.Roopal vs Lt. Governor of Delhi**¹ that precedents are to be strictly adhered to.*

XXXXX

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:*

¹ (2000) 1 SCC 644

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.“



II. As submitted by the applicants, representations of some applicants have been rejected in 2019 informing the applicants that, no orders on the subject have been issued by the MoD/ DoP&T. After perusing the said order, this Tribunal is of the view that they are not speaking orders and proper disposal of the requests of the applicants, particularly in view of the various Court orders referred to above.

III. In view of the above, the respondents are directed to consider and dispose of the requests of the applicants for eligible relief with consequential benefits, keeping in view the orders cited supra, by passing a speaking and reasoned orders, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of this order

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

(B.V.SUDHAKAR)

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)

JUDICIAL MEMBER

evr