

75

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

New Delhi OA 2394/2004

New Delhi this the 15<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2005

**Hon'ble Mrs. Meera Chhibber, Member (J)**

Smt. Sunder Devi @ Shashi Devi,  
W/O Late Shri Daya Ram Lamba,  
Present r/o WZ-30, New Hira Park,  
Dicahu Road, Najafgarh, New Delhi.

..Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Yogesh Sharma )

**VERSUS**

1. The Union of India  
(Through the Secretary),  
Ministry of Telecommunication,  
Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,  
Jaipur Telecommunication District,  
MI Road, Jaipur.
3. Accounts Officer (TA),  
0/0 General Managers Telecommunication,  
Distt. Jaipur.

..Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Chandan Kumar )

**O R D E R (ORAL)**

By this OA, applicant has sought a direction to the respondents to grant family pension from the date of death of her husband with all consequential benefits including arrears of pension with interest. During the pendency of this OA, respondents have filed their reply along with all



the documents to show that all arrears have already been paid to applicant, which was recorded in the order sheet dated 11.8.2005. This fact has not been disputed by the applicant, however, she insisted for interest. Therefore, liberty was given to applicant to place on record the documents to show that she had already submitted information which was called for by the respondents in 1998 for settling her claim but in spite of 2 months having been granted to the applicant, no such documents have been placed on record till date. I am satisfied that respondents have already granted the main claim as made by the applicant and, therefore, this OA does not survive any longer. No case for grant of interest has been made out by the applicant because respondents have annexed the documents to show that applicant has given the required information only in June 2005 and PPO has been issued immediately thereafter in July 2005, therefore, relief for interest is rejected.

2. In view of the above, this OA is dismissed as having become infructuous. Counsel for applicant requested that he may be given liberty to make a representation to the respondents for grant of medical allowance of Rs. 100/-per month. I do not think that any such liberty is required to be given by the court. If applicant is entitled to get the medical allowance in accordance with law, she can always make a representation to the



respondents. In case any representation is given by the applicant, I am sure, the same will be considered and decided by the respondents in accordance with law. No order as to costs.

  
15/9/05  
( Mrs. Meera Chhibber )  
Member (J)

SK