

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

OAHAKA/CCP No. 326 1991

Badri Nath Sehgal Shri R. P. Saxena
APPLICANT(S) COUNSEL

VERSUS

Delhi Admn.
RESPONDENT(S)

COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>8.2.91.</p> <p>Shri R. P. Saxena, Counsel for the Applicant.</p> <p>Heard. The relief claimed in this application is to direct the respondents to count the service of about one and a half years rendered by the applicant under the fourth respondent, the Damodar Valley Corporation for the pensionary benefits. Admittedly that service was not taken into account having regard to clause (4) of the O.M. dated 29.8.84 issued by the Government of India, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms by which Central Autonomous Body is defined as a body which is financed wholly or substantially from cess or central government grants, and where it is further provided that "substantially" means that more than 50 per cent of the expenditure of the body is met through cess or central government grants. In the instant case since only 50 per cent of the expenditure is met by the central government grants, according to the relevant clause it cannot be considered as a central autonomous body and as such, the action on the part of the respondents in not taking into account the service rendered by the applicant in the Corporation cannot be faulted.</p> <p>The application is rejected.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(P. C. Jain) (G. Sreedharan Nair) Member (A) V.C. (J)</p>