

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

O.A. No.414 of 2010

Panchu .....Applicant

Vs

UOI & Ors. .....Respondents

Order dated: 13-07-2011.

C O R A M

THE HON'BLE MR. C.R.MOHAPATRA, MEMBER (ADMN.)

.....

Heard Learned Counsel for both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

The Applicant while working as Bridge Khalasi in the E.Co.Railway, on attaining the age of retirement superannuated from service on 31.3.2005. Alleging non payment of his statutory retirement dues, despite repeated representations, he approached this Tribunal in OA No.512 of 2009 to direct the Respondents to revise his pension w.e.f. 1.1.2006 to Rs.3500/- + DA + Medical Allowance and to pay him the differential dues. Mr.S.K.Ojha, represented for the Respondents and submitted that steps have been taken to revise the pension and issue of revised PPO. Based on the statement of Mr.Ojha, this Tribunal disposed of the OA No. 512 of 2009 on 04-11-2009 directing the Respondents 2 & 4 to take appropriate decision on the pending representation of the applicant and communicate the decision to the applicant in a well

6

reasoned order within a period of 45 days. The Respondents communicated the applicant the decision taken on his representation. Thereafter, again this OA has been filed in which the <sup>applicant</sup> has sought direction to the Respondents to pay him the differential arrears of pension by fixing his monthly pension at Rs.3500+DA w.e.f. 01-01-2006. Respondent-Railway, filed their counter in which it has been stated that as per the Sixth Pay Commission's recommendations the pension of the applicant has already been revised to Rs.3500/- plus DA plus Medical Allowance with effect from 01-01-2006 and arrears thereon have been paid to the applicant by the Pension Disbursing Bank i.e. Central Bank of India, Puruna Baulamala Branch, Jajpur. In this connection copy of the letter dated 15.12.2009 of the Branch Manager of Central Bank of India, Puruna Baulamala Branch Jajpur has been enclosed to the counter as Annexure-R/1. Perused the said letter. No rejoinder has been filed by the Applicant controverting this aspect. In view of the above there remains nothing further in this OA for adjudication. Hence this OA stands dismissed as infructuous.

  
(C.R.MOHAPATRA)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)