

19

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

O.A. NO. 394/92

New Delhi this the 7th day of November, 1994

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE S. C. MATHUR, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE SHRI P. T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (A)

K. P. Dohre,  
Additional Industrial Adviser (Retd.),  
R/O B2/63, Paschim Vihar,  
New Delhi - 110063.

... Applicant

( In Person )

Versus

Union of India through  
Secretary (TD) & DG (TD),  
Udyog Bhawan,  
New Delhi - 110011.

... Respondent

( By Advocate Shri V. S. R. Krishna )

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Shri Justice S. C. Mathur, Chairman :-

In this application, the main grievance of the applicant relates to correction of certain errors. In pursuance of the Tribunal's earlier order, the learned counsel for the respondent has produced the relevant record.

2. The first grievance of the applicant related to the incorrect recording of his father's name. The father's name had been earlier recorded as Shri Raja Ram Dohre. The learned counsel for the respondents has placed before us a copy of the letter dated 2.8.1992 addressed by Dy. Director (Cash) in the Directorate General of Technical Development to the Accounts Officer, Pay & Accounts Office, D.G.T.D., New Delhi. In this letter, the Accounts Officer

J

20

has been directed to mention the name of the applicant's father as Shri Nain Sukh Dohre. The applicant admits that the name of his father is Shri Nain Sukh Dohre. Accordingly, the grievance of the applicant in respect of the incorrect recording of his father's name stands satisfied.

3. The next grievance of the applicant related to the incorrect recording of his height. In the letter dated 2.8.1992 the applicant's height has been mentioned as 5 ft. 6 inch. The applicant admits that this is his correct height. Accordingly, this grievance also stands satisfied.

4. With reference to Annexure-I to the reply, the applicant has stated that the height of his wife has been incorrectly recorded as 5 ft. 10 inches. The applicant invited our attention to column 27 where that height is recorded. That column does not relate to the applicant's wife. It relates to the applicant himself. As already mentioned, the applicant's height has been corrected. The applicant's grievance in respect of incorrect recording of his wife's height is misconceived.

5. In Annexure-I to the reply the applicant's substantive post is mentioned as 'Assistant Meteorologist'. The applicant's claim is that his substantive post was Development Officer. The applicant admits that his said claim is subject matter of O.A. No. 2437/92. Since the matter is sub-judice, it cannot be said at this stage that the entry in column 6(i)

of Form-7 is incorrect. We hope that if the said original application is decided in favour of the applicant, the respondents shall make necessary corrections in this behalf.

6. The applicant has stated that he is at least entitled to be recorded as Assistant Development Officer. This question also can be decided in the other original application. We accordingly make no observation in respect of this claim of the applicant.

7. In column 11 of Form-7 the period of service of the applicant has been mentioned as 29 years 2 months and 7 days. The applicant's claim is that the total period of service comes to 29 years 3 months and 7 days. This position is not disputed by the respondents. The respondents have already informed the Accounts Officer through letter dated 27.1.1992 in this behalf. Accordingly, this grievance of the applicant also stands satisfied. A copy of this letter appears to have been forwarded to the applicant also. The applicant disputes receipt of this letter. The respondents may ensure incorporation of the corrections in Form-7. The correction at this stage is only of academic interest as the applicant admits that his pension has been paid on the basis that he had served for 29 years 3 months and 7 days.

8. The next grievance of the applicant related to the omission of the name of his son Ajay Kumar in Form-7. For making this correction, the respondents have already issued letter dated 4.12.1991, a copy of

which has been filed as Annexure III-A to the reply. This matter, however, is also of academic interest as the applicant himself admits that his son Ajay Kumar has crossed the age of 25 years. Ajay Kumar will, therefore, get no benefit of family pension.

9. We have heard the applicant and the learned counsel for the respondent on the applicant's claim of interest which he states still remains due. Orders on this aspect shall be as under :-

It is admitted that out of the eligible pension of Rs.1,945/- p.m. only an amount of Rs.1,912/- was released from 1.8.1990. Subsequently, in the year 1992, the pension amount was enhanced to Rs.1,945/-. Because of the revision in pension, additional amounts had to be released by way of DCRG, commutation of pension and additional pension for the period from 1.8.1990 to February, 1992. Since the additional commuted value of pension and gratuity were due right at the time of retirement and the enhanced pension over the period 1.8.1990 to February, 1992, it will be fit and proper if interest at the rate of 12% is paid on these amounts which were released late in February, 1992. The respondents are directed to calculate the interest due and deduct from this amount the actual interest which has been paid (the applicant admits that interest to the extent of Rs.175/- has already been paid to him). The remaining amount of interest so calculated should be paid to the applicant within two months from the date of receipt of this order.

10. This application is disposed of finally. There shall be no orders as to costs.

P. J. Dri

( P. T. Thiruvengadam )  
Member (A)

S. C. Mathur

( S. C. Mathur )  
Chairman

/as/