

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/021/250/2021

HYDERABAD, this the 23rd day of March, 2021



**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**

Sri B. Daniel, S/o. Late Jacob, Gr. C,
Aged about 65 years,
Retd., Khalasi Helper,
O/o. Dy. CSTE/P/SC,
S.C. Railway, R/o. H.No.12-7-125/1,
New Mettuguda, Lallaguda Post,
Hyderabad – 500 017.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Sri G. Pavana Murthy)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by its
The General Manager,
South Central Railway, 3rd floor,
Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
S.C. Railway, 4th floor, Railnilayam,
Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Secunderabad Division,
Sanchalan Bhavan, Secunderabad.
4. Deputy Chief Signal and Telecommunication Engineer,
Projects /Near RRC Grounds,
S.C. Railway, Secunderabad.
5. The Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer,
Railnilyam, S.C. Railway,
Secunderabad.
6. The Bank Manager, Canara Bank, (Proforma Party)
(Erstwhile) Syndicate Bank, Rail Nilayam Branch,
Secunderabad.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Smt A.P. Lakshmi, SC for Rlys.)

ORAL ORDER

(As per Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member)

The present O.A. is filed challenging non-implementation of the Office Memorandum dated Nil.August, 2015 and the inaction of the 2nd respondent to consider the representation dated 29.10.2019 for revision of the pay and pension of the applicant as per his entitlement.



2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant retired on 30.06.2015 from the respondent's organization. MACP benefit was sanctioned to him after his retirement but he has not received the actual payment. Even though more than 5 years have lapsed, till date the applicant's pay and pension were not revised taking the financial upgradation benefit. As a result, payment of difference of Gratuity, Commutation, Leave Encashment etc. and revision of pension are pending consideration before the authorities.

3. Heard Sri G. Pavana Murthy, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. A.P. Lakshmi, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, we are of this view that the O.A. can be disposed of with a direction to the respondents to dispose of the representation within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The respondents are directed accordingly. The applicant is granted liberty to re-approach this Tribunal, if the grievance still subsists.

5. With the above direction, the O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission, without looking into the merits of the case. No order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

/nv/