

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

76

OA No. 748/97 &
749/97

Date of Decision: 1st July, 1997

BETWEEN:

S. Subba Rao

.. Applicant

AND

1. The Director, National Research Centre
for Sorghum, Rajendra Nagar,
Hyderabad - 500 030
2. The Secretary, Indian Council of
Agricultural Research, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110 001.
3. Government of India, rep. by its
Secretary, M/o Commerce, New Delhi
4. The Director, Directorate of Oil Seeds
Development, Telhen Bhavan, Himayathnagar,
Hyderabad-500 029.
5. The Secretary M/o Agriculture,
Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi - 110 001

.. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. A. Rama Narayana

counsel for the Respondents: Mr. K. Ramuloo

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Sri H. Rajendra Prasad: Member (Admn.) *Q*

77

ORDER

(Per Hon'ble Sri H. Rajendra Prasad: Member (Admn.))

Since the facts in these 2 OAs are intimately linked and inter connected the cases were heard together. Mr. Ram Narayana, learned counsel for the applicant, made his submissions. There was none for the respondents.

2. The grievances of the applicant in these OAs are:-
 - i. Deduction of amounts representing the difference between the market rent and normal rent in respect of a Type-IV residential quarter allotted to him, by the Director of Oil Seeds Development, (R-4) for the period 1.9.83 to 31.7.89 (according to the applicant up to 5.6.1990).
 - ii. ^{Deduction of} Interest on House Building Advance outstanding at the time of his retirement;
 - iii. Reduction in the scale of his pay from 1.1.1986.

The applicant complains that despite protracted correspondence amongst the concerned offices and many representations, he has not received a satisfactory or adequate reply from Respondent-1 (R-1) i.e., Director, National Research Centre for Sorghum. There is considerable overlapping of facts in these cases since the alleged outstanding dues on account of the rent of the residential quarters are seen to be a common factor in both cases. The applicant himself is not very clear at this stage as to what precisely are the amounts due from him and what, consequently, are his entitlements. The matters are not helped by the apparent silence on the part of the respondents. In order, therefore, to clear the confusion, Respondent-I is directed to have the case examined, on the basis of the facts contained in these OAs, besides any other record that may be available in his office, and finally determine

Q.

(R)

the applicant's claim afresh without ambiguity. He shall do so within 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and arrange thereafter to send a detailed communication to the applicant indicating the following:-

- a) The number, location and other details of the quarter in question;
- b) Date of allotment:
- c) Date of vacation :
- d) Normal Rent from to :
- e) Paid by /
deducted from (the applicant's pay) :
- f) Market Rent from to :
- g) Paid by / deducted from
(the applicant's pay/retiral benefit):
- h) Amount due :
- i) HBA Sanctioned:
 - i) Amount :
 - ii) Date :
 - iii) Principal :
 - iv) Interest :
- j) Amount Recovered :
- k) Outstanding from the applicant:
 - i) Principal :
 - ii) Interest :
 - iii) Remarks :

4. Similar detailed reply may be arranged to be given to the applicant in respect of the pay-scales about which he complains in the OA.

5. It is scarcely necessary to add that the settlement of the applicant's ^{due} claims, if any, need to be attended to very expeditiously since the officer has retired from service almost an year ago.

(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Date: 1st July 1997.