

75

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 309/99

DATE OF ORDER : 7.6.2000

Between :-

Kusumanchi Visweswararao

...Applicant

And

1. Joint Controller of Defence Accounts
(Funds), Meerut Cantonment, Uttar Pradesh.
2. Controller of Defence Accounts (Navy),
No.1, Cooperage Road, Mumbai-400 039.

...Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri A.Srinivasa Sarma

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Vinod Kumar, Addl.CGSC

-- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

✓

-- -- --

...2.

✓

76

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

-- -- --

Heard Sri A.Srinivasa Sarma, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri V.Vinod Kumar, learned standing counsel for the Respondents.

2. The applicant has retired as Sr.Auditor on 30.6.1997. His grievance is that his GPF Account has not been maintained properly. Rupees 540/- for the year 1983-84 and Rs.840/- for the year 1984-85 had not been credited to his GPF Account and thus he is still eligible to receive further amount of Rs.5,734/- as GPF in addition to the amount already paid to him.
3. The second grievance of the applicant is that the leave account of the applicant is not maintained properly. He is eligible for leave encashment of 119 days.
4. The above two points ~~does~~ not need any interpretation of law or rule. The above grievances can be resolved by factual verification of the records. Hence we are of the opinion that the applicant should sit with Respondent No.1 with the records available with him to state so as mentioned above. Respondent No.1 should produce the records available with the Department to show whether the points mentioned by the applicant have been covered or not. If it has been taken note of, the relevant entries has to be shown to the applicant. The minutes of the meeting of the applicant and Respondent No.1 should be ^{prepared} ~~made~~. If the applicant is not satisfied with that joint statement, he is at liberty to write his own views


✓


✓

and rebut the minutes where required and that ^{the} consolidated minutes of the applicant and respondent No.1 should be put up to Respondent No.2 for his consideration. Respondent No.2 should issue a reasoned order on the basis of the minutes and basing on other relevant records if any. If the applicant and Respondent No.1 make a unanimous minutes, that minutes are binding on the respondent authorities. Respondent No.1 should advise the applicant suitably to be present in his office indicating the time and date to hold the above said meeting.

5. Time for compliance is three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. O.A. is ordered accordingly.

No costs.


(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (A)
7.6.2000


(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (A)

Dated: 7th June, 2000.
Dictated in Open Court.


now

avl/