

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.314/98

Wednesday, this the 18th day of March, 1998.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR AV HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR SK GHOSAL, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Sethunathan.K.,
Benglowil, Valiyakada,
P.O.Chirayinkeezh,
Thiruvananthapuram. - Applicant

By Advocate Mr P Ravindran

Vs

1. The Secretary,
Department of Space,
Government of India,
Government Secretariat,
New Delhi.
2. Union of India represented by
its Secretary,
Department of Space,
Antarish Bhavan,
New Bel Road, Bangalore.
3. The Director,
Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre,
Indian Space Research Organisation.P.O.
Thiruvananthapuram. - Respondents

By Advocate Mr CN Radhakrishnan(rep)

The application having been heard on 18.3.98, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR AV HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant who was compulsorily retired while
working as Canteen Supervisor, has earlier filed an application
aggrieved by the fact that he was not given any pension. That
application O.A.847/95 was disposed of with a direction to the
respondents that applicant's representation claiming pension

should be considered and disposed of by them with a speaking order. Pursuant to the above direction, the respondents have considered the case of the applicant and have issued a Pension Payment Order dated 10.5.87 A-1. The grievance of the applicant is that his Army service for ten years and service under the Water Authority for eight months have not been taken into account while computing the qualifying service for the purpose of pension. The counsel of the applicant states that this grievance was brought to the notice of the respondents orally, but it was not favourably considered. It is under these circumstances that the applicant has filed this application for a direction to the respondents to consider his ten years Army service and also service under the State Government and to count that also as qualifying service for pension.

2. When the application came up for hearing today, learned counsel of the respondents stated that if the applicant would make a representation with supporting documents for his claim for revision of pension, the respondents would consider that and give the applicant a speaking order within a time to be stipulated by the Tribunal. Learned counsel of the applicant states that the applicant would be satisfied if such a direction is given.

3. In the light of what is stated above, we dispose of this application giving liberty to the applicant to make a representation in regard to his grievances, to the first respondent and with a direction to the first respondent that if such a representation is received by him within a period of one month from the date of communication of this order, the

same shall be considered in accordance with the rules and a speaking order communicated to the applicant, within a period of two months thereafter. No costs.

Dated the 18th March, 1998.



(SK GHOSAL)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



(AV HARIDASAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

trs/19398