

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 1094/93

Transfer Application No:
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 22.2.1994

Shri G.U.Attar

Petitioner

Shri R.D.Deharia

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

Respondent

Shri Subodh Joshi

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

~~The~~ Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Shri

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


(M.S.DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, BOMBAY

DA.NO. 1094/93

Shri Ghudubhai Umarsaheb Attar

... Applicant

V/S.

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Vice Chairman Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande

Appearance

Shri R.D.Deharia
Advocate
for the Applicant

Shri Subodh Joshi
Advocate
for the Respondents

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 22.2.1994

(PER: M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman)

By this application the applicant seeks a refund of Rs.6775/- which has been deducted from the amount of the gratuity payable to him and interest on Rs.34650/- on the DCRG which should have been paid to him immediately on his superannuation on 31.12.1990 ^{but} ~~were~~ came to be paid on 7.1.1993.

2. The respondents' contention is that the applicant was incharge of the stores and there were certain deficits. When the stores were verified in 1991 it was found that material worth Rs.6775/- ^{was} ~~caused~~ deficiency and this amount was deducted from the DCRG which ^{to be} ~~was~~ paid to the applicant and the balance was paid to the applicant.

3. It is apparent that no enquiry as contemplated by Rule 9 of the Pension Rules was held in respect of the pecuniary loss said to have occasioned to the respondents,

.. 2/-