

31

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:  
HYDERABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.95/93 in  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. of 199

Date of decision: 2-4-96

Mohd. Ibrahim

APPLICANT(S)


Versus


Sri G.C. Sandle, DRM, SC Rly.  
Secunderabad BG Divn., Sanchalan Bhavan  
..Secunderabad..321  
and another

RESPONDENT(S)

FOR INSTRUCTIONS

1. Whether it be referred to the Reporters  
or not?
2. Whether it be circulated to all the  
Benches of C.A.T. or not?

  
(R. Rangarajan  
Member (Admn))

  
(M.G. Chaudhari)  
Vice Chairman/Member ( )

32

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.95/93 in  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.209/91 dt.2-4-96

Between

Mohd. Ibrahim : Petitioner

and

Sri G.C. Sandle,  
DRM, SC Rly, Secunderabad BG Divn.  
Sanchalan Bhavan, Secunderabad-371

Sri P. Murugan  
CPD, SC Rly, Rail Nilayam  
Secunderabad 371 : Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : G.V. Subba Rao, Advocate

Counsel for the respondents : V. Rajeswara Rao,  
SC for Railways

CORAM

HON. MR. JUSTICE M.G. CHAUDHARI, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON. MR. R. RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

Judgement

( As per Hon. Mr. Justice M.G. Chaudhari, V.C. )

Heard Sri G.V. Subba Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri V. Rajeswara Rao, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents today produced a letter dated 1-4-1996 issued by the DRM(P) of South Central Railway from which it appears that proforma fixation of arrears from 1-1-1986 to 31-3-90 have been worked out and a sum of Rs.8,165/- has been

... 2 .

*lma*

33

2

paid to the applicant towards the same. The learned counsel for the respondents also produced a signed acknowledgement of the applicant dated 13-5-1994 accepting the said payment. The letter also shows that the pension has been revised accordingly and settled at Rs.1,287/- p.m.


3. The learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the applicant still has the grievance that the amount of pension although has been revised it has not been correctly fixed. However, there is nothing shown that the applicant had disputed the correctness of the said amount and had filed a representation to the respondents. We are sorry to note that the respondents are not in a position even today to tell us as to on what date Pension Payment Order has been issued or whether the applicant is withdrawing the amount of pension regularly since the arrears have been paid as far as back as on 13-5-1994. The order dated 15-3-1994 thus stands complied with and there arises no question of any action being taken in contempt. However, as we are not able to know whether the PPO has been actually issued, <sup>or not</sup> we direct the respondents to issue the same within a period of one week from the date of receipt of this order. We also give liberty to the applicant to approach the respondents by way of a representation if he is aggrieved by the refixation of the amount of his pension per month. In order to enable the applicant to do the respondents also are directed to inform him the basis on which Rs.1,287/- p.m. has been determined as his pension. Such information should be supplied to him unless it is reflected in the PPO within a period of one week from the date of receipt of this order,

~~copy.~~

..3.

lnk

4. The petition is accordingly disposed of. However, we make it clear that if the pension payment order if it has not so far been issued and will not be issued within one week from the date of receipt of this order, then this CP may be revived at the instance of the applicant.

  
(R. Ranganajan)  
Member (Admn.)

  
(M.G. Chaudhari)  
Vice Chairman

Dated : April 2, 96  
Dictated in Open Court

  
Deputy Registrar (D)cc

sk