

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PATNA BENCH, PATNA.**

**O.A. No. 798 of 2005**

**Date of order : December 20, 2005**

**C O R A M**

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P.K. Sinha, Vice-Chairman**

Yogendra Rai and 3 others

Vs.

Union of India and ors.

For the Applicant : Shri Pramod Mishra

For the respondents : Shri A.A. Khan

**O R D E R (Oral)**

**By Justice P.K. Sinha, V.C. :-**

Heard learned counsel for both sides. The application of the applicants filed separately to allow them to prosecute the case jointly is hereby allowed.

2. The applicants (three in number) are pension holders in the Ministry of Railways, whereas applicant No. 4 is family pension holder. They were getting their pension as well family pension from the concerned post office, but their P.P.Os were missed from the concerned post office as a result of which the medical allowance and 15 % of D.A are not being paid to them. It is submitted that on 21.6.2005, the respondent, Senior Post Master, Chapra sent his letter to the respondent, Accounts Director (P) for issuance of duplicate P.P.Os in favour of the applicants.

3. This matter should have been firstly placed before the concerned authority in the railways, so that the authority concerned could have recorded order for issuance of duplicate P.P.Os.



4. In the circumstances, as mentioned in the case, Shri A.A. Khan, the learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 3 submits that on being approached, the concerned railway <sup>authority</sup> would consider issuance of duplicate P.P.Os at the earliest.

5. This application is disposed of by directing the applicants to file separate application before the authority concerned for issuance of duplicate P.P.Os., whereafter respondents No. 1 to 3, particularly, DRM, N.E. Railway, Varanasi, E.C. Railway, Sonapur and North Frontier Railway, Katihar will see that the order about issuance of duplicate P.P.Os in favour of the applicants <sup>is</sup> recorded within <sup>two</sup> months of the receipt of copy of this order along with representation, if there be no legal barrier. In case duplicate P.P.Os are not issued within this period, the concerned DRM will record speaking order for that.

6. The applicants, while sending their concerned representation, would also submit to the concerned authority copy of this order as well <sup>a</sup> copy of this application with its annexures.

7. With these directions this OA stands disposed of.

  
(P.K. Sinha) / V.C.

/cbs/