

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

O.A.No.81/2001

Date of order: 14.8.2001

S.N.Soni, S/o Sh.Bhura Mal Soni, R/o Soni Sadan,

Ramlila Maidan, Sikar, Retired SA&HSG II, RMS, Sikar

...Applicant.

Vs.

1. Union of India through the Secretary to the Govt of India, Deptt.of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General, Rajasthan Circle, Jaipur.
3. Sr.Supdt, Railway Mail Service, Jp.Dn, Jaipur.
4. Head Record Officer, Jp.Dn, RMS, Jaipur.

...Respondents.

Mr.P.N.Jati : Counsel for applicant

Mr.N.C.Goyal : for respondents.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr.S.K.Agarwal, Judicial Member.

PER HON'BLE MR S.K.AGARWAL, JUDICIAL MEMBER.

In this O.A filed under Sec.19 of the ATs Act, 1985, the applicant makes a prayer to direct the respondents to pay interest @ 18% per annum on delayed payment, as per Annx.Al.

2. Reply was filed.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the whole record.

4. It appears that the applicant sought voluntary retirement w.e.f. 1.1.2000. On a perusal of the averments made by the parties, it also appears that the applicant was paid the retiral benefits as follows:

i) GPF amount Rs.1,00,094/- on 14.3.2000

ii) Commutation of pension Rs.199,329.00 on 17.4.2000

Sonale

- iii) Arrears of Pension Rs.10089.00 on 17.4.2000
- iv) Leave encashment Rs.74528/- on 3.5.2000
- v) Gratuity Rs.153,714 on 3.5.2000
- vi) CGEIS Rs.11918 on 7.8.2000

5.1 As per instructions issued from time to time by Govt of India, six months time is the permissible period for the department to make payment of the retiral dues to the applicant in case his voluntary retirement is accepted. In my considered view, the applicant is not entitled to any interest on any of the payment made to the applicant.

6. The counsel for the applicant submits that the payment of CGEIS Rs.11,918 was made to the applicant on 7.8.2000, therefore, this delayed payment the applicant is entitled to interest. A proper explanation to this effect has been given by the respondents' department to which there is no rejoinder. Therefore, in my considered view, the applicant is not entitled to any interest on the payment made in lieu of his voluntary retirement effective from 1.1.2000 and this O.A devoid of any merit is liable to be dismissed as such.

7. I, therefore, dismiss this O.A having no merit with no order as to costs.



(S.K. Agarwal)

Member (J).