

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 985/95

Transfer Application No.

Date of Decision 15.2.1996

Shri M.G.Chandanshiv

Petitioner/s

Shri R.K.Jain

Advocate for  
the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

Respondent/s

Shri R.R.Shetty


Advocate for  
the Respondents

CORAM :

Hon'ble Shri. B.S.Hegde, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri.

- (1) To be referred to the Reporter or not ? ☒
- (2) Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? ☒

  
(B.S.HEGDE)  
MEMBER (J)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

OA.NO. 985/95

Shri Madhukar Ganuji Chandanshiv ... Applicant

V/S.

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Member (J) Shri B.S.Hegde

Appearance

Shri R.K.Jain  
Advocate  
for the Applicant

Shri R.R.Shetty  
Advocate  
for the Respondents

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 15.2.1996

(PER: B.S.Hegde, Member (J))


Heard Shri R.K.Jain for the applicant and Shri Ravi Shetty for the respondents. Pleadings are complete. The OA. is admitted and the same is disposed of at the admission stage itself.

2. The applicant retired in the year 1983 and he had not received pensionary benefits within a month as per the rules for payment of settlement dues to a Railway employee, whereby he seeks interest on delayed payment. The respondents in the reply stated that the delay in payment of settlement dues to the applicant was exclusively on account of the applicant's non-cooperation and non-finalisation of the settlement papers which were handed over to him from time to time. Ultimately, the applicant finally filled up the pension papers on 16.9.1987 after repeated requests and personal contact by the Senior Welfare Inspector at the residence of the

*Handwritten signature*

applicant. Thereafter, the respondents paid the pensionary benefits to the applicant on 16.1.1988 within a period of 4 months from the date of completion of the formalities so far as the payment of pension of the applicant is concerned by the applicant. Regarding Provident Fund, the same was passed and paid by the respondents vide their letter dated 2.7.1985 for Rs.5221.80.

3. In the circumstances, I do not think that there is any justification in seeking any interest for the alleged delay in the payment of pensionary benefits as the delay was on the part of the applicant himself. In the circumstances, I do not see any merit in the OA. and the same is dismissed on merits at the admission stage itself.

  
(B.S. HEGDE)  
MEMBER (J)

mrj.