



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**O.A. No. 1343/2021**

**This the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of July, 2021**

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

Abha Sethi,  
D/o Shri Shyam Sundar,  
Aged about 59 years,  
Senior Translation Officer,  
Indian Air Force,  
HQ Western Air Command,  
Command Education Section,  
Subroto Park, Delhi Cantonment,  
Delhi – 110010. Group 'B'  
Mobile No. 9891079590  
Resident of: 117 SFS, Punjabi Bagh Apartments,  
Rohtak Road, New Delhi - 110063

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri Tushar Ranjan Mohanty)

**Versus**

1. Union of India,  
Through the Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
South Block, Rajpath, E Block,  
Central Secretariat, New Delhi – 110011.
2. Chief of Air Staff,  
Indian Air Force,  
Western Air Command,  
Vayu Bhavan, Rafi Marg, Delhi – 110106.

... Respondents

(By Advocate : Ms. Neetu Mishra for Shri K.M. Singh)



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

### **Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

The applicant worked as Senior Translation Officer in the Indian Air Force. Over the period, she was extended the benefit of ACP or MACP, as the case may be. The 2<sup>nd</sup> MACP was extended to her w.e.f. 01.09.2008, the date on which MACP scheme became effective. Her grievance is that she was extended the benefit of 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP w.e.f. 01.09.2018, whereas it ought to have been extended from 07.02.2016, the date on which she completed 30 years of service. She retired from services on 30.04.2021.

2. The applicant filed this OA with a prayer to direct the respondents to extend the benefit of 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP w.e.f. 07.02.2016. Since the benefit was denied to her on the basis of Office Memorandum dated 17.07.2015, she has also challenged that OM.
3. Today, we heard Shri Tushar Ranjan Mohanty, counsel for applicant and Ms. Neetu Mishra for Shri K.M. Singh, counsel for respondents.
4. The grievance of the applicant is that 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP ought to have been extended to her w.e.f. 07.02.2016, the date on which she completed 30 years. The applicant seems to be

Item No.6



under the impression that the employee is entitled to be extended the benefit of MACP just on completion of 10, 20 and 30 years of service. Though the impression may be correct to some extent, the fact remains that MACP is dependent upon an employee not getting the promotion or financial upgradation in the relevant span of 10 years. It is not the case of the applicant that she did not get any upgradation after completion of her 20 years of service i.e. 07.02.2006. Once the respondents have taken into account, the benefits that have been extended to the applicant and granted 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP on 01.09.2018, we do not find any basis to interfere.

5. We do not find any merit in the OA and the same is accordingly, dismissed.

There shall be no orders as to costs.

**(A.K. Bishnoi)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/sd/rk/ns/akshaya/