

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.66/99

Friday this the 25th day of February, 2000

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

C.R. Gangadharan  
S/o Raman aged 58 years  
Retired Khalasi  
Southern Railway,  
Office of the Inspector of Works  
(Construction), Ernakulam Junction,  
residing at Cheruvankandathil House,  
Kattikunnukara, Chempu PO,  
Kottayam District.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. T.C.Govindaswamy)

v

1. Union of India represented by the General Manager, Southern Railway, Headquarters Office, Park Town PO, Madras.3.
2. The Chief Engineer (Construction) Southern Railway, Egmore, Madras.8.
3. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Construction) Southern Railway Ernakulam.
4. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, Trivandrum Division Southern Railway, Trivandrum.
5. The Divisional Railway Manager, Southern Railway, Trivandrum Division, Trivandrum.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mrs. Sumati Dandapani (rep.))

The application having been heard on 25.2.2000 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following;

.....2

(w)

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

This is an unfortunate case in which a railway servant after long years of service had to retire with just nine years one month and twenty four days of service thereby being ineligible to get pension. Though the applicant was senior enough to be empanelled and absorbed in a Group D post right from the year 1984 on account of his low <sup>he</sup> medical classification could not be appointed on the post of Gangman or any other Group D post. He was empanelled and provided a lean on a Group D post only by order dated 10.3.97. When he retired from service on 31.3.98 as he did not according to the respondents have the sufficient length of service qualifying for pension he has not been granted pension. The applicant has filed this application for a declaration that he is entitled to monthly pension and other retiral benefits.

2. The respondents have filed a detailed reply statement explaining as to how the applicant did not qualify for pension.

3. When the matter came up for final hearing today, learned counsel of the applicant seeks permission to withdraw this application with permission to make a detailed representation to the Ist respondent. In the light of the request made by the counsel of the applicant, the application is closed as withdrawn permitting the applicant to make a representation to the Ist respondent.

It is expected that the 1st respondent would consider the representation sympathetically in the light of the rules and instructions on the subject and give the applicant a speaking order. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 25th day of February, 2000



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

S.