

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CIRCUIT SITTINGS AT NAGPUR.

XXXXXXDXXXXXX

O.A. No. 749 of 1988
XXXXX

DATE OF DECISION 14.3.1989

Ku. Nanda Kantilal Deore Petitioner

Mr. M.R. Borkar Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others. Respondent

Shri S.V. Gole (for Mr. S.V. Natu) Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. M.B. Mujumdar, Member (J)

The Hon'ble Mr.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? Yes
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? No
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? No
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? No

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
CIRCUIT Sittings AT NAGPUR.

Original Application No. 749/88

Ku. Nanda Kantilal Deore,
Amardeep Building,
Room No.7, Subhash Road,
Vishnunagar, Dombivali(W),
Dist: Thane-421 202

.. Applicant

V/s.

1. Union of India
through Secretary
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
(Dept. of Pension & Pensioners'
Grievances),
New Delhi-1.

2. Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Expenditure,
New Delhi-1

3. Secretary,
Department of Post,
Dak Tar Bhavan,
Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-1.

4. Director of Accounts(Postal),
Civil Lines,
Nagpur.

.. Respondents.

Coram: Hon'ble Member(J), Shri M.B. Mujumdar.

Appearance:

1. Shri M.R.Borkar
Advocate for the
applicant.
2. Shri S.V.Gole (for
Shri S.V.Natu)
Advocate for the
respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT:-

(Per: Shri M.B.Mujumdar, Member(J))

Dated: 14.3.1989

Heard Mr.M.R.Borkar, learned advocate for the
applicant and Mr.S.V.Gole (for Mr.S.V.Natu) advocate
for the respondents. Respondents have also filed a

Contd...2/-

brief reply stating facts and opposing admission.

2. One Shri Kantilal Kashinath Deore who was working as Porter died on 5.11.1965 leaving behind widow Sindhumi and daughter Nanda, i.e. the applicant aged 1½ years. After the death of Kantilal Sindhumi was getting pension till she re-married in 1967. After her re-marriage, Nanda also received pension upto 30.12.81 i.e. till she attained 18 years. On her representation directions were given for giving her family pension upto 31.12.1984 i.e. till she attains the age of 21 years. She was representing further for getting pension upto the age of 21 years. As her request was not conceded she filed the present application on 11.10.1988 praying that she should be given family pension till the age of 25 years. She has also prayed for interest on arrears of family pension at the rate of 18% per annum.

2. However, after the application was filed by an order dated 20.2.1989 directions are given for giving family pension to her till she attains the age of 30 years or till she marries, whichever is earlier. I am told that the applicant is given arrears of family pension till January, 1989.

3. Hence the applicant has received more than what she had claimed in the application. Still Mr. Borkar, learned advocate for the applicant urged that the applicant should be given interest on arrears of family pension. But I do not think that the applicant will be entitled to claim interest on arrears of family pension. No doubt there was some delay in paying the family pension to her but it must be because of some administrative difficulties. Hence I do not think