

(11)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

Original Application No. 161 of 1988

Date of decision: 10th May, 1990.

1. R. Sanjeeb Rao,  
Under Divisional Railway  
Manager, (Mechanical), S.E. Railway, Khurda  
P.O. Jatni, Dist. Puri  
As Retired Diver, Grade-A Khurda Road,  
Hat Bazar, P.O. Jatni, District-Puri.

..... Applicant

(Vs)

1. Union of India, represented by  
General Manager, S.E. Rly, Garden Reach Road,  
Calcutta-43, Munsifi-24 Paragana (W.B.).
2. Financial Advisor & Chief Accounts Office,  
(Pension), 11, Garden Reach Road,  
Calcutta-43,  
Munsifi-24, Paragana (W.B.)
3. Divisional Railway, Manager, S.E. Rly (Mech)  
Khurda Road, P.O. Jatni,  
Munsifi-Khurda, Dist. Puri.

..... RESPONDENTS

For the Applicant. ... Mr. Ramanath Das, Advocate

For the Respondents. ... Mr. Ashok Mohanty,  
Standing Counsel (Railway)

-----

C O R A M :

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. BALASUBRAMANIAN (Member (A))  
AND

HON'BLE SHRI N. SENGUPTA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

-----

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed  
to see the judgement ? Yes.
  2. To referred to the Reporters or not ? No
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair  
copy of the Judgement ? Yes.
-

:- J U D G E M E N T :-

N. SENGUPTA, MEMBER (J)

The applicant admittedly was a Railway servant working as a Special Grade Driver in Khurda Road, Division of S.E. Railway and retired in June, 1982. The applicant's grievance is that his pension was not correctly calculated or revised properly and the other grievance is that he has not been paid his dues <sup>for</sup> ~~to~~ utilised leave. ~~he has heard~~

We have heard Mr. R. N. Das for the applicant and Mr. Ashok Mohanty for the Respondent and perused the pleadings of the contesting parties. On reading the reply in counter by Railway Administration it would appear that in fact there was some mistake in the revision of the pension paid to the applicant, since it has been rectified and copies of the order for payment of the enhanced amount have already been sent to the Bank <sup>chosen</sup> ~~chosen~~ by the applicant for payment of his pensionary benefits and also to the applicant, the relief with regard to the revision of the pension of the applicant has already been given by the Respondent, nothing more remains for this Tribunal to do in that regard. Mr. Das for the applicant makes a grievance that he has not received any copy of the order for payment of the enhanced revised pension. Without going to examine this contention of Mr. Das, we would direct that the respondents should give another copy of the order for payment of enhanced revised pension, preferably by registered post, to the applicant so as to avoid <sup>future</sup> ~~for the~~ complications.

Mr. Das  
18/5

(12)

(v)

- the claim for -

3. With regard to the relief relating to ~~clear~~<sup>clear</sup> utilised leave salary, we are unable to accede to the prayer of the applicant because there is no material before us to come to a conclusion that any wrong calculation of leave due to the applicant was made.

4. The application is accordingly disposed of leaving the parties to bear their respective costs.

*P. B. Anantharaman*  
 10/5/90  
 .....  
 MEMBER (ADMN)



*M. S. Sanyal* 10.5.90  
 .....  
 MEMBER (JUDICIAL)