

Central Administrative Tribunal Lucknow Bench Lucknow

O.A. NO.26/2007

Lucknow this, the 25th day of August, 2009

Hon'ble Dr. A. K. Mishra, Member (A)

Gyaneshwar Pant, aged about 69 years, son of late Dharma Nand Pant, resident of B-1, sector-H, Aliganj, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate Sri Shireesh Kumar.

Versus

1. Union of India, through its Secretary, Ministry of Steel & Mines, Shashtri Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Director General, Geological Survey of India, 27, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Kolkata.
3. Chief Controller of accounts, Ministry of Steel & Mines, Government of India, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-1.
4. The Controller of Accounts, Geological Survey of India, 16-A Brabourne road, Kolkata-1.
5. Pay & Accounts Officer, Geological Survey of India, Northern Region, Aliganj, Lucknow.
6. The Director of audit, (Formerly Accountant General), (Commerce Works & Misc.), Government of India, AGCR Bhawan, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi-2

Respondents.

By Advocate Sri S. P. Singh.

Order

By Hon'ble Dr. A. K. Mishra, Member (A)

The applicant has challenged the order dated 14.5.2004 of Pay and Accounts Officer of Geological Survey of India (GSI) (N.R.) in which it was clarified that there was no double debiting in the



GPF account statement of the applicant in respect of the advances taken by him.

2. The main grievance of the applicant, as seen from his various representations starting with one made on 1st October 1986 (Annexure -2), is that the advances taken by him (Rs. 1500/- during 67-68, Rs. 2,400 + Rs. 1000/- during 70-71) were debited twice in his GPF account. As a result, his total amount has fallen short by Rs. 4900/-. The statement attached to Annexure 2 gives these details.

3. The applicant had filed O.A. No. 576 of 2002 before this Tribunal which, in its judgment and order dated 5.9.2003, directed the respondent authorities to examine in detail the grievance of the applicant as made out in his representations and finalize the issue expeditiously keeping in view the fact that he had already retired from Government service. The applicant filed another representation on 5th of July 2004 (Annexure-9) and repeated his allegations of double debiting .

4. At the time of hearing, I asked the learned counsel for the respondents to file a copy of his GPF Account Card after serving a copy on the other side. Such a copy was placed before me on the last date of hearing. Let me consider the grievance of the applicant in respect of each instance of double debiting. He complains that the advance of Rs.1,500/- relating to 1967-68 was earlier debited in his GPF account in the same year and the advances of Rs. 1000/- and Rs. 2,400/- of 1970-71 were also debited in the account of that year. But they have been debited again in 1973-74 and 78-79 respectively.

ly

5. From the GPF card maintained, I find that the advance of Rs. 1500/- was not debited in the year 67-68; further Rs. 1000/- was not debited in the year 70-71, and the advance of 2400/- was also not debited in the year 70-71. Therefore, the allegation of double debiting is not borne out by facts which have been explained in the impugned letter of the Pay and Accounts Officer.

6. The confusion, as I see it, has crept in because of the misleading entries made in the GPF account slips issued for the year 77-78 where it has been wrongly mentioned about debiting of Rs. 1500/- during 11/67 and Rs. 2400/- in 70-71. The errors have also occurred in the slips for 67-68 and 70-71 where, against withdrawal column, the advance amounts have been shown.

7. But a little closer examination of these slips submitted by the applicant at Annexure- 1 would establish the case of the respondents. For example, the slip for the year 67-68 takes the opening balance at Rs. 3,148/-, accounts for deposit of Rs. 1050/- and interest of Rs.149/- and withdrawal of Rs. 1500/- made during the year. The total instead of coming to Rs. 2487/- was wrongly shown as Rs. 4347 which was carried forward to the next year as the opening balance. This is true of the account slip for 70-71 where the closing balance should have been of Rs. 4527/-, but it was erroneously shown as Rs. 9424/- in an alternative entry, which was carried forward as the opening balance for the next year. These mistakes were rectified later on and the position was explained clearly by the respondent authorities in the impugned letter. Therefore, there is no basis for the allegation of double debiting.



8. In the circumstances, the application is dismissed. No costs.


(Dr. A. K. Mishra)
Member (A)

Vidya