

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A. NO. 709 /95

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 22-6-95

BETWEEN:

N.V. Surya Rao.

.. Applicant.

and

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Defence, Sena Bhavan,
New Delhi.
2. Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief,
Head Quarters, Eastern Naval Command,
Visakhapatnam-14.
3. Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dockyard,
Visakhapatnam.

.. Respondents.

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: SHRI K. Sudhakar Reddy

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI N.R. Devraj,
Sr./Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

CONTD....

JUDGMENT

(As per Hon'ble Sri R.Rangarajan, Member(Administrative))

Heard Sri K.Sudhakar Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.R.Devaraj, learned Standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant herein joined as Unskilled Labour in Naval Dockyard, Eastern Naval Command, Visakapatnam on 27.6.1970 and was promoted to Gr.I Fitter Welder on 1-1-1971. Thereafter, he was further promoted to the post of Mechanical Welder in the year 1975 and as Senior Chargeman on 19-2-1981. The post of Senior Chargeman is non-industrial post. However, the applicant's initial appointment was to industrial cadre. The age of superannuation for the employees in Industrial Cadre is fixed at the age of 60 and in respect of non-industrial cadre, the said age of superannuation is fixed at 58 years of age. As the applicant herein was a Senior Chargeman and the post of Sr. Chargeman is non industrial post, the concerned authority issued an office note No.PES/3800/NVSR dt. 2.9.1994 retiring him on 30.9.1995 on attaining the age of 58 years. The contention of the applicant that as he initially belonged to industrial cadre, he should have been allowed to work up to the age of 60 years and he cannot be superannuated after completion of 58 years, as per Respondent's letter dt. 6.6.1994. He further submits that he is covered by FR 56(b) and CSR 459(b) in regard to the terms and conditions of service for his superannuation. Though, he represented against his superannuation or the age of 58 by representation dt. 17.2.95 requesting the respondents authorities to retain him in the service upto the age of 60 years by treating him as

industrial worker, his request was turned down and he was informed by the impugned order dt. 2.9.1994 that he will retire at the age of 48 years. Aggrieved by the above, he has filed this OA for a declaration that LetterNo.PES/3800/NVSR dt.2.9.1994 is illegal, arbitrary, void ab initio and unconstitutional and for a consequential direction to the respondents to treat him as a part of industrial establishment on promotion as Senior Chargeman and consequently retire him from service on superannuation only after attaining the age of 60 years in accordance with CSR 459(b) and FR 56(b) with all consequential benefits.

3. The Principal Bench in a similar case in OA 1709/89, Lal Chand and Ors. Vs. Union of India directed the respondents in that case to treat the applicants therein as a part of industrial establishment on promotion as Chargeman/Senior Chargeman and consequently shall retire them from service on superannuation only after they attain the age of 60 years in accordance with CSR 459(b) and FR 56(b). But that direction was stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.8529-31 of 1990 by order dated 3.9.1990. When another Senior Chargeman of 505, Army Base Workshop EME, Delhi Catt. filed OA No.626/90 to retire him after attaining the age of 60 years treating him as an industrial worker as directed in the case of Lal Chand and Ors. Vs. UOI, the respondents in that OA submitted that as the SLP in Lal Chand's case is pending, the case cannot be decided in favour of the applicant therein. However, the Principal Bench disposed of the said OA No. 626/90 by orders dt. 8.7.1994 directing that the applicant therein is entitled for the benefits etc. as in the case of Lal Chand Vs. UOI OA No.1709/89, as decided by the

(20)

Principal Bench on 30.9.1990 if the aforesaid judgment is upheld by the Supreme Court and the SLP filed by Union of India against the said judgment is dismissed. However, it was further held by the Principal Bench in that OA that in case the SLP is allowed the OA 626/90 stands dismissed.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that a similar direction, as was given in OA 626/90 on the file of the Principal Bench can also be given in this case as the applicant herein is similarly situated as the applicant in OA 626/90. The learned standing counsel has also expressed no objection to the above course suggested by the applicant's counsel. In view of the above, ~~a direction has been given to the applicant that he attains the age of 58 years in terms of impugned order. However, he will get the monetary benefits if the judgment in Lal Chand's case is upheld by the Apex court.~~

5. In ~~the~~ result, the following direction is given:-

In the conspectus and circumstances of the case, the applicant has to be retired on attaining the age of 58 years. However, the applicant shall be entitled to all the benefits etc. of the case of Lal Chand and Others Vs. Union of India (OA 1709/89 on the file of Principal Bench) decided on 30.3.1990 if the aforesaid judgment is upheld by the Apex court and SLP bearing No.8529-31/90 filed by Union of India against that judgment is dismissed. In case the Apex court allows the SLP and directs that Senior Chargeman even if they are initially appointed in industrial cadre are to superannuate at the age of 58 years, this OA stands dismissed. In case the SLP referred to above is decided by any other modified order, other than the orders given by the Principal Bench, then this OA shall also be disposed of in terms of the orders which may be

D

81

passed by the Apex court in the aforesaid pending SLP filed by Union of India. If any clarification is required by either parties in regard to the directions given in this OA after the SLP referred to above is disposed of, a M.A. in the OA may be filed for obtaining necessary clarifications.

6. The OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage itself. No costs.

One

(R. Rangarajan)
Member (Admn.)

Neeladri
(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated 22 June, 1995.

XXX

Grh.

Amulya
Deputy Registrar (J) CC

To

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Sena Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Flag Officer, Commanding-in-Chief, Head Quarters, Eastern Naval Command, Visakhapatnam-14.
3. The Admiral Superintendent, Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam.
4. One copy to Mr. K. Sudhakar Reddy, Advocate, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

With copy

pvm

22/6/95

THPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN: (M(ADMN)

DATED 22/6/ 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

in
OA. No. 709/95

TA. No. (W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

*JAN
22/6/95*

