

In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Calcutta Bench

OA No. 911 of 1997

Present : Hon'ble Mr. D. Purkayastha, Judicial Member

Madan Chandra Bera

Vs.

S.E. Railway

For the Applicant : Mr. A. Chakraborty, Ld. Advocate

For the Respondents: Ms. B. Ray, Ld. Advocate

Heard on : 8-6-98


Date of Judgement : 8-6-98

ORDER

When the case was taken up for admission, Mr. Chakraborty, Ld. Advocate submits that he did not file any representation before the authority for getting relief as prayed for in this application. Ld. Advocate Ms. Ray is present on behalf of the respondents. No reply has been filed by the respondents. It is found that the applicant was initially appointed in the Railway on 27-6-63 and retired from service w.e.f. 1.3.97. According to the applicant, he completed 34 years of continuous service in the Railway before his retirement. Thereby, he is entitled to get benefit of 34 years of qualifying service for granting benefit of pension. But that has been denied to the applicant. It appears that 34 years of qualifying service was not taken into account for granting benefit of pension as per letter dated 10.3.97 (Annexure 'A' to the application). In view of the facts and circumstances, I think it would be a fit case to direct the applicant to make a representation to the authority stating the grievances therein within one month from to-day. Respondents are directed to dispose of the representation with speaking/reasoned order within two

Contd.....

months from the date of receipt of the representation from the applicant. The decision, if taken, should be communicated to him within one month from the date of taking decision. It is further mentioned that if the decision goes in favour of the applicant, then the pension should be recalculated accordingly and should be paid ^{to him} the same ^k forthwith. Applicant would have liberty to approach this Tribunal if he disagrees with the said decision. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.


(D. Purkayastha)
Member (J)