21

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

R.A.No.21/1994 IN O.A.No.1444/88

NEW DELHI THIS THE 4th DAY OF JANUARY, 1995

HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER(J) HON'BLE SHRI B.K. SINGH, MEMBER(A)

Lt Col C.M. Gupta (Retd.) C/o Tishu & Fibres Ltd., Gol Jamala, Nalagarh, Solan, (H.P.)

...Applicant

(By Advocate :Shri Aruneshwar Gupta with Shri Karamveer Damija)

VERSUS

- 1. UNION OF INDIA, THROUGH

 Secretary (R)
 Cabinet Secretariat
 Room No.8B, South Block
 NEW DELHI.
- Cabinet Secretary,
 Prime Minister Secretariat
 South Block,
 NEW DELHI. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri M.K. Gupta)

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

R.A.21/94 in O.A.1444/88; Lt Col C.M. Gupta Vs Union of India & Others: By a judgement of the Division Bench of this Tribunal, the case of the applicant in O.A.1444/88 was decided by the Order dated 23.11.1993 by which the application was dismissed, and the relief prayed for by the applicant was for a direction to the respondents to formulate

22.

guidelines for declaring the retired Defence Personnel on re-employment as permanent and subsequently permanent after they have put in more than 3 years of regular service. It has also prayed that the rule whereby a re-employed pensioner ex-serviceman can be declared permanent only after putting in 6 years of service, be declared un-constitutional and be quashed. The applicant has also prayed for payment of gratuity for the period has served on re-employment in the Civil post. At the time of the hearing ofr the Original Application none had appeared on behalf of the applicant and the case was decided on the basis of the pleadings.

 \mathbb{N}

5

2. The Review Application has been admitted and notices were issued to the respondents i.e. Union of India

Contd....3...

We heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

- The learned counsel for the revew applicant has of pressed the relief non-payment/grant of the gratuity to applicant as he has served for more than 5 years with the respondents on re-employment after discharge from the military service. The contention of the learned counsel has been gone through by us and he has placed reliance on Rule 50 of CSS (Pension) Rule 1972 wherein a provision has been made for grant of retirement/death gratuity to government servant who has completed 5 years qualifying service and has become eligible for service gratuity or pension under Rule 49, shall on his retirement, be granted death-cum-retirement gratuity equal to onefourth of his emoluments for each completed six monthly period qualifying service, subject to maximum $16\frac{1}{2}$ times the emoluments.
- 4. The contention of the learned counsel is that since the applicant has completed 5 years of service on re-employment in the Cabinet Secretariat, he is entitled to service

at the calculated rates. we have considerd this fact in our judgement but since none appeared on behalf applicant when the case was decided, however, gave an opportunity to the learned counsel point out an error apparent on the face judgement/ that of the the 1awrelied by the learned counsel he accepted and judgement can be reviewed in that light only with regard to the relief of grant of gatuity to the applicant.

0

Je

the learned counsel for the respondents

Shri MK Gupta pointed out that in view of
the Sub-clause 2 of Rule 7 of the CCS (Pension)

Rules, 1972 which is quoted below, the applicant is
not entitled to the benefit of gratuity on re-employment:

"Except as provided in Rule 19, a Government servant who, having retired on a superannuation pension or retiring pension, is subsequently re-employed shall not be entitled to a separate pension or gratuity for the period of his re-employment."

It is undisputed that the applicant was not confirmed in the Civil employment after he had been re-employed in the Cabinet Secretariat. The learned counsel for the applicant, however, argued that the sub-clause 2 of Rule 7 has to be read with Clause 1 of the same rule and the re-employment should be confined

25

same service and it should not be to the any other We have considered service. the contention of the learned counsel with reference to the Rule 19, which is an exception to rule, sub-clause 2 of Rule 7 and that squarely covers ex-serviceman who employed after discharge from the military The judicial review can only be service. for interpretation of the clause as per the intention of the legislature. The judicial review cannot enlarge the ambit and scope substituting words not intended bу legislature when the rules were framed. The contention of the learned counsel is that the word 're-employed' has to be taken re-employed in the same service, accepted. This word has natural disctionary meaning re-employed, means $ar{}$ the re-employed in any service whatsoever.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant has also referred to the qualifying service in the definition clasue 3 of the CCS (Pension)Rules,1972 that the service rendered on duty or otherwise which shall be taken into account for the purpose of pension and gratuity admissible under the rules. It

is undoubtedly an accepted proposition that the applicant has worked for about 5 years but he could not be confirmed because statutory rules that only after 6 years completing service, the incumbent be confirmed; so he could get any benefit because he was not confirmed in his appointment and more so his appointment was contractual basically for one year at the initial posting of -employment and then it was extended from year to year basis.

under review 7. have gone through our judgement/ the conclusion we have arrived at after and hearing the counsel is that there is no error on the face of the judgement. The Review Application, therefore, is dismissed being devoid merit, leaving the parties to bear own costs.

(B.K. SINGH)
MEMBER (A)

of many

(J.P. SHARMA) MEMBER (J)