

Open Court

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD**

Allahabad, this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021

**Original Application No. 330/00467/2021**  
(U/S 19, Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985)

Present:

**Hon'ble Mr. Devendra Chaudhry, Member-(Administrative)**

Hoob Narain Pandey, Aged about 61 years (Date of Birth 28.06.1960), S/o Late Shobh Nath Pandey, R/o Village – Tala Majhwara (Padan), Post – Sehmalpur, Jalapur, District – Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh. 222136. Retired Sub Post Master (retired on 30.06.2020) in post office Bazar Neorahia, under Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Jaunpur.

.....Applicant

By Advocate: Shri Sachin Upadhyay.

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Telecommunication, Department of Post, Government of India, New Delhi. 110011.
2. Chief Post Master General, UP Circle, Lucknow.
3. Assistant Chief Accounts Officer/Pension, DAP, UP Circle, Sector-D, Aliganj, Lucknow.

-----Respondents

By Advocate: Shri Chakrapani Vatsyayan.

**ORDER**

Undersigned has joined this Bench online through video conferencing. Shri Sachin Upadhyay, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Chakrapani Vatsyayan, learned counsel for the respondents both are present in court.

2. Heard Id the counsels for both the parties at admission stage.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the relief sought in the instant case is with respect to grant of one notional increment on 01.07.2013, for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, with all consequential benefits and to re-fix the pension accordingly, as well as pay the arrears in a time bound period manner in the light of the judgment ***dated 26<sup>th</sup> February 2021 passed in Original Application No. 146/2020 Pravesh Chandra Gupta and others Vs. Union of India and Ors.***
5. Heard learned counsel for the respondents who has nothing to add at this stage.
6. The operative portion of the Judgment passed in OA No. 146/2020 reads as below:-

"22. In the case of ***State of Karnataka & Others Vs. C. Lalitha, (2006) 2 SCC 747***, the Apex Court has held as under:-

***"29. Service jurisprudence evolved by this Court from time to time postulates that all persons similarly situated should be treated similarly. Only because one person has approached the court that would not mean that persons similarly situated should be treated differently."***

7. In the light of the above, it stands to reason that the applicant if covered by the same fact, should be granted the similar relief as per law.

8. Accordingly, I am of the opinion that the applicant may be granted the same relief as has been granted by this Tribunal to the applicants in the OA No. 146/2020, if the facts are similar.

9. Accordingly, the OA is disposed of finally at admission stage with direction to the respondents/competent authority amongst the respondents to grant the same relief as has been granted by this Tribunal to the applicants in the ***OA No. 146/2020 Pravesh Chandra Gupta and others Vs. Union of India and Ors.*** if, the facts are similar within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

10. The order so passed, shall be communicated to the applicant without any delay.

11. It is made clear that I have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

12. No order as to costs.

**(Devendra Chaudhry)**  
**Member (Administrative)**

/Shashi/