

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ALLAHABAD BENCH

THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2003

Original Application No.778 of 2000

CORAM:

HON.MR.JUSTICE R.R.K.TRIVEDI,V.C.

B.D.Bajpai, son of late Shri Ganga  
Sahai Bajpai, R/o 43/44 Adarsh  
Nagar, Barra-l district Kanpur Nagar.

.. Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through  
Secretary, Ministry of Telecommunication  
Department of Post & Telegraph  
New Delhi.
2. Post Master General, Kanpur  
Region, Kanpur.
3. Chief Post Master, Pradhan Dak Ghar  
Barra Chauraha, Kanpur.
4. Director Postal Audit & Account  
U.P.Circle at Lucknow.

.. Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

JUSTICE R.R.K.TRIVEDI,V.C.

By this application u/s 19 of A.T.Act 1985, applicant has prayed for a direction to the respondents to refund the amount of Rs 10,926/- to the applicant with interest which ~~has~~ been illegally deducted from his retiral benefits.

The facts of the case are that applicant retired from service as Assistant Post Master on 30.11.1993. Applicant was paid all the retiral benefits. However, it is claimed by the applicant that an amount of Rs 10,926/- was deducted from the amount of GPF on the ground that there was loan which was due from the applicant. It is also stated by the applicant that the actual amount payable by the applicant was Rs 9,925/-. However, respondents have illegally deducted Rs 10,926/-. It is

:: 2 ::

admitted position that applicant had taken a loan of Rs 1800/- from GPF account on 26.2.1974 which remain unpaid. Thus, the respondents were entitled for recovery of the amount.

Resisting the claim of the applicant counter affidavit has been filed wherein it is stated that actual recovery from the applicant was Rs 6,926/-. It has been denied that respondents recovered Rs 10,926/- as alleged by the applicant. Respondents have filed documents showing the complete account, from perusal of which it is clear that the applicant had borrowed Rs 1800/- on the date mentioned above and recovery of the amount was due which has been deducted. Thus, there is no good ground to interfere. The applicant is not entitled for any relief.

The OA has no merit and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.



VICE CHAIRMAN

Dated: 25th march, 2003

Uv/