

12
(OPEN COURT)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD**

Allahabad, this the 29th day of October, 2012

**Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member-J
Hon'ble Mr. Shashi Prakash, Member- A.**

**Original Application No. 1620 of 2003
(U/s 19 of Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985)**

Suraj Prasad, S/o Harihar Prasad, R/o Hanuman Mandira Crossing, C.C. Road, Deoria.

..... **Applicant.**

By Advocate: *Shri S.K. Dey (not present)*
 Shri S.K. Mishra (not present)

V E R S U S

1. Union of India through the General Manager, E. Rly., Calcutta.
2. The Financial Advisor & Chief Accounts Officer, E. Rly., Calcutta.

..... **Respondents**

By Advocate : *Shri D.S. Shukla*

O R D E R

By Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, J.M.

None present for the applicant even in the revised call. Since the matter pertains to the year 2003 and the pleading are complete, therefore, we decided to proceed by exercising the power conferred under Rule 15(1) of CAT (Procedure) Rules 1987.

2. By way of the instant original application the applicant seeks quashing of the order dated 02.05.2003 with a direction to the respondents to make payment Rs. 38706/- as due PF with interest from 01.12.1994 and interest from 01.12.1994 against paid amount Rs. 65370/- on 16.12.1998 as leave salary and packing allowance.

3. We have gone through the pleadings particularly the impugned order dated 02.05.2003 (Annexure A-5), by which the respondents have decided the claim of the applicant. In the last paragraph of the order dated 02.05.2003 it is stated as under:-

“ It is, however, stated that the office of CAO/PF, E. Rly., Kolkata would still strive to connect papers / documents to verify whether any unconnected PF balance of the petitioner exists if Sri Prasad is able to furnish any official documents in support of his claim.” .

4. From reading of the above it is clear that the applicant was required to furnish documents in support of his claim but from the pleadings we find that the applicant has not furnished the documents pursuant to the letter dated 02.05.2003.

5. In view of the above we find no reason to interfere with the order dated 02.05.2003. Accordingly the O.A is dismissed. No costs.


Member-A.


Member-J.

Anand/