

22

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD.  
O.A.NO.805 of 1994.

Between

Dated: 18.9.1995.

Tatineni Koteswara Rao

...

Applicant

And

1. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Ministry of Defence,  
Yessumailaram, Medak District, A.P.-205.
2. Chief Controller of Accounts (FYS) (CC of A (FYS), 10A,  
Auckland road, Calcutta-001.

...

Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Sri. T.Koteswara Rao (P-I-P)

Counsel for the Respondents : Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. A.B.Gorthi, Administrative Member

Contd:....2/-

O.A. 805/94.

Dt. of Decision : 18-09-95.

ORDER

{ As per Hon'ble Shri A.B. Gorthi, Member (Admn.) }

Heard Shri T.Koteswara Rao, Party-in-person and  
Shri N.V. Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA is for a direction to the respondents

(a) to allow conveyance charges as per extant Govt.  
of India Order for the journeys performed by the applicant on  
certain occasions,

(b) to pass certain bills submitted by the applicant  
claiming higher rate of DA for stay at Hyderabad, and

(c) to clear all the pending bills submitted by the  
applicant upto July 1993.

3. The applicant was working as a Senior Labour Officer  
in the Ordnance Factory, Medak from August 1990 to 14-08-1993.  
During his tenure he was sent on official duty to various places  
but was not paid the allowances due to him as per extant rules.  
His representations were also not properly considered. He has  
given the details of various bills and claims which according  
to him have not been correctly processed by the respondents.

4. The respondents in their reply affidavit seem to  
meet the request of the applicant to an extent. Firstly they  
stated that the Road Mileage Allowance at the rate of Rs.2/-  
per KM, though claimed by the applicant, was not paid, but it  
was paid at the rate of Rs.1/- per KM. The respondents clarified  
that they were not in <sup>receipt</sup> ~~respect~~ of the orders of the Directorate  
of Transport, Hyderabad indicating the rates of auto-rickshaw  
allowances. They say that they have now taken necessary steps  
to pay the applicant the difference of Road Mileage Allowance  
and accordingly supplementary bills for the difference have  
already been forwarded to the Chief Controller of Accounts (FYS).

(24)

In this context the prayer now made by the applicant is for a direction to the respondents to settle all the out-standing bills on account of difference of Road Mileage Allowance within a period of two months.

5. As regards certain claims for higher rate of DA the respondents contend that as per SR-51 Clause 3(4), if an officer returned to Head Quarters after completion of duty, the same day, he will draw daily allowance at ordinary rates. Accordingly, his claim was processed on the presumption that he returned to Head-quarters on the same day. The contention of the applicant is that there is nothing on record to indicate that he returned to Head-quarters on the same day. Learned counsel for the respondents says that the relevant record <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ not available now to ascertain whether or not on each occasion the applicant returned to Head quarters on the same day. Consequently, it will be open to the applicant to make a representation to the respondents together with any documentary evidence in case he feels certain that he did not return to the Head quarters on the same day in respect of any of his claims for higher DA.

6. In respect of claim dated 01-06-1991 for Road Mileage Allowance, the applicant claims <sup>ed</sup> Auto fare from Yeddumailaram to Shankarpally and ~~back~~ and Rail fare from Shankarpally to Hyderabad and back. The office ~~however~~ admitted auto fare as claimed by the applicant but restricted the rail fare to that of bus fare at the rate of Rs. 10/- per each journey. This the respondents say was <sup>done</sup> with the concurrence of the applicant. The applicant however denies having given ~~a~~ his consent. In case the respondents <sup>do not</sup> have ~~a~~ the ~~concurrence~~ of the applicant on record in writing, the respondents will have to process the case of the applicant

(24)

with regard to the RMA claim submitted on 01-06-1991 ~~on~~ the assumption that he had given no such ~~consent~~ ~~for~~ ~~restricting~~ the rail fare to that of bus fare at the rate of Rs. 10/- for each journey.

7. If there is any claim pending or outstanding the respondents must process the same and settle the claim expeditiously.

8. Respondents shall take action as <sup>directed &</sup> ~~communicated~~ above within a period of two months from the date of communication of this order.

8. The OA is disposed of ~~as~~ Accordingly. ~~There is~~ no order as to costs.

(A.B. Gorti)  
Member (Admn.)

Dated : The 18th Sept. 1995.  
(Dictated in Open Court)

Dy. Registrar (Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Ministry of Defence, Yeaddumailaram, Medak District, A.P.-205.
2. Chief Controller of Accounts (FYS) (CC OF A (FYS), 10A, Auckland road, Calcutta-001.
3. One copy to Sri. T.Koteswara Rao, Party in person, Plot No.213, Road No.6, Ramakrishnapuram, Secernagar, Hyd-035.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Adml. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

TYPED BY

A. 805/94  
CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER.

HON'BLE MR.

JUDICIAL MEMBER.

ORDER/JUDGEMENT:

DATED: 12.9.1995.

M.A./R.A./C.A.NO.

IN

O.A.NO.

805/94

T.A.NO.

(W.P.NO.)

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED.

ALLOWED.

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS.

DISMISSED.

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN.

DISMISSED FOR DEFAULT.

ORDERED/REJECTED.

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS.

\*\*\*

Rsm/-

No spare copy

