

(12)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
NEW BOMBAY BENCH, NEW BOMBAY.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.580/87.

Bhopinder Singh,  
Chief Claims Officer,  
3rd Floor, Station Building,  
Western Railway,  
Headquarter Office, Churchgate,  
BOMBAY - 400020.

.. Applicant.

V/s.

1. Union of India, through  
General Manager, W. Railway,  
Churchgate, Bombay.
2. Secretary, Ministry of Rlys.,  
(Railway Board), Railway Bhawan,  
Raisina Road, New Delhi.
3. Chief Medical Officer,  
Western Railway,  
Headquarters Office,  
Churchgate, Bombay.
4. Chief Signal & Telecommunication  
Engineer, Western Railway,  
Headquarters Office, Churchgate,  
Bombay - 400 020.

.. Respondents.

CORAM : Hon'ble Shri Justice U.C. Srivastava, Vice Chairman.  
Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A).

ORAL JUDGMENT

DATED: 17.7.1991.


PER : Hon'ble Shri U.C. Srivastava, Vice Chairman

The applicant who was a senior officer in the Railway had undergone treatment outside India. The dispute in this application is reimbursement of expenses so far as the telephone calls overseas are concerned or the reimbursement in respect of other reliefs of other reliefs that have already been granted to him. The case of the applicant is that the Doctors were making inquiries about

O.A.580/87.

his conditions regarding his treatment and as such he is entitled to the said amount up to the tune of Rs.9000/-. The applicant in this connection also relied on the letter dt. 4.2.1987 Ex.D/1 regarding waiver of trunk call charges made in connection with the open heart surgery of the applicant. The letter has been issued by the Secretary (S & T) Railway Board, New Delhi. In the said letter, it is stated, however, that the item of trunk call charges booked in connection with the by pass surgery in USA does not figure as one of the qualified items for reimbursement.

2. The respondents in their additional reply dated 18.7.1988 have disputed the claim of the applicant and have stated on the basis of a letter from the Telephones Department that these calls were not by Doctors and claims regarding all the calls are false as all the calls were made to parties other than doctors in U.S.A. and, therefore, charges of the trunk calls have to be borne by the applicant. No such rule has been pointed out before us from which the applicant is entitled to reimbursement of the said charges. The learned counsel for the applicant contended that the telephone charges were in connection with the medical treatment of the patient. We are afraid we cannot make such an interpretation which has got no relevance with the telephone charges. We do not find any substance in the application, it is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

  
( M.Y. PRIOLKAR )  
MEMBER(A).

  
( U.C. SRIVASTAVA )  
VICE CHAIRMAN.