

4.

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH

Original Application No.266/96 and series

Date of decision: This the 10th day of June 1997
(AT KOHIMA)

The Hon'ble Mr Justice D.N. Baruah, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr G.L. Sanglyine, Administrative Member

.....

1. Original Application No.266 of 1996
Shri Ram Bachan and 14 others
By Advocate Mr A. Ahmed
.....Applicants
-versus-
Union of India and others
By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.
.....Respondents
2. Original Application No.268 of 1996
Shri Nomal Chandra Das and 55 others
By Advocate Mr A. Ahmed
.....Applicants
-versus-
Union of India and others
By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.
.....Respondents
3. Original Application No.279 of 1996
Shri D.D. Bhattacharjee and 31 others
By Advocate Mr A. Ahmed
.....Applicants
-versus-
Union of India and others
By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.
.....Respondents
4. Original Application No.18 of 1997
Shri Hari Krishan Mazumdar and 24 others
By Advocate Mr A. Ahmed
.....Applicants
-versus-
Union of India and others
By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.
.....Respondents
5. Original Application No.14 of 1997
Shri Jatin Chandra Kalita and 19 others
By Advocate Mr A. Ahmed
.....Applicants
-versus-
Union of India and others
By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.
.....Respondents

4
6. Original Application No.91 of 1996

Shri Daniel Sangma and 81 others

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta.

-versus-

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

By Advocate Mr G. Sarma, Addl. C.G.S.C.

7. Original Application No.87 of 1996

Shri C.T. Balachandran and 32 others

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta

-versus-

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

By Advocate Mr G. Sarma, Addl. C.G.S.C.

8. Original Application No.45 of 1997

Shri L. Shashidharan Nair and 9 others

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta

-versus-

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

By Advocate Mr G. Sarma, Addl. C.G.S.C.

9. Original Application No.197 of 1996

Shri P.C. George and 66 others

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma

-versus-

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

By Advocate Mr A.K. Choudhury, Addl. C.G.S.C.

10. Original Application No.28 of 1996

Shri Hiralal Dey and 8 others

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr A.C. Sarma and Mr H. Talukdar

-versus-

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

By Advocate Mr A.K. Choudhury, Addl. C.G.S.C.

B

11. Original Application No.190 of 1996

1. National Federation of Information and Broadcasting Employees, Doordarshan Kendra, Nagaland Unit, represented by Unit Secretary - A. Beso.

2. Mr A. Beso, working as Senior Engineering Asstt. (Group C), D.D.K., Kohima.Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta

-versus-

Union of India and othersRespondents

By Advocate Mr A.K. Choudhury, Addl. C.G.S.C.

12. Original Application No.191 of 1996

Shri Kedolo Tep and 16 othersApplicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta

-versus-

Union of India and othersRespondents

By Advocate Mr A.K. Choudhury, Addl. C.G.S.C.

13. Original Application No.55 of 1997

1. Shri Ranjan Kumar Deb, Secretary, All India R.M.S. & Mail Motor Service Employees Union and 32 others.

2. Shri Prasenjit Deb, S.A., Railway Mail Service, Dimapur Railway Station, Dimapur, Nagaland.

.....Applicants

By Advocate Mr N.N. Trikha

-versus-

Union of India and othersRespondents

By Advocate Mr G. Sarma, Addl. C.G.S.C.

14. Original Application No.192 of 1996

1. National Federation of Information and Broadcasting Employees, All India Radio, Nagaland Unit, represented by Unit Secretary - Mr K. Tep.

2. Mr Kekolo Tep, Transmission Executive, All India Radio, Kohima, Nagaland.Applicants

By Advocate Mr S. Sarma and Mr B. Mehta

-versus-

Union of India and othersRespondents

By Advocate Mr S. Ali, Sr. C.G.S.C.

AB

15, Original Application No.26 of 1997

Shri Jagdamba Mall,
General Secretary, Civil Audit & Accounts
Association, and 308 other employees of
the Office of the Accountant General,
Kohima, Nagaland.

....Applicants

By Advocate Mr N.N. Trikha

-versus-

Union of India and others

....Respondents

By Advocate Mr G. Sarma, Addl. C.G.S.C.

.....

ORDER

Date of decision: 10-6-1997

Judgment delivered in open court at Kohima (circuit
sitting). All the applications are disposed of. No order as to
costs.

Sd/- VICE CHAIRMAN

Sd/- MEMBER (A)

nkam

ORDER

BARUAH, J. (V.C.)

All the above applications involve common questions of law and similar facts. Therefore, we propose to dispose of all the applications by this common order.

2. Facts for the purpose of disposal of the applications are:

The applicants are employees of the Government of India working in various departments including Defence Department. O.A.Nos.266/96, 268/96, 279/96, 18/97 and 14/97 are Defence Civilian employees under the Ministry of Defence, O.A.Nos.91/96, 87/96, 45/97, 197/96 and 28/96 are employees in the Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau Department under the Ministry of Home Affairs, in O.A.No.190/96 the members of the applicant Association are employees under Doordarshan, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, and at present posted at Kohima, in O.A.No.191/96 the applicants are employees of the Department of Census, Ministry of Home Affairs, in O.A.No.55/97 the applicants are employees under Railway Mail Service under the Ministry of Communication, in O.A.No.192/96 the members of the applicant Union are employees of All India Radio, and in O.A.No.26/97 the applicant is an employee under the Comptroller and Auditor General.

3. All the applicants are now posted in various parts of the State of Nagaland. They are, except the applicant in O.A.No.55/97, are claiming House Rent Allowance (HRA for short) at the rate applicable to the employees of 'B' class cities of the country on the basis of the Office Memorandum No.11013/2/86-E.II(B) dated 23.9.1986 issued by the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance (Deptt. of Expenditure), New Delhi, on the ground that they have been posted in Nagaland.

The President of India issued an order dated 8.1.1962 to the effect that the employees of P&T Department in the Naga Hills and Tuensang Area who were not provided with rent free quarters would draw HRA at the rate applicable to the employees of 'B' class cities of the country on the basis of O.M.No.2(22)-E.II(B)60 dated 2.8.1960. However, the authorities denied the same to the employees ignoring the circular of 1986. Situated thus, being aggrieved some of the employees approached this Tribunal and the Tribunal gave direction to the authorities to pay HRA to those applicants with effect from 18.5.1986. Being dissatisfied with the aforesaid order passed by this Tribunal in O.A.No.42(G) of 1989, S.K. Ghosh and others -vs- Union of India and others the respondents filed SLP and in due course the Supreme Court dismissed the said SLP (Civil Appeal No.2705 of 1991) affirming the order of this Tribunal passed in O.A.No.42(G) of 1989 with some modification. We quote the concluding portion of the judgment of the Apex Court passed in the above appeal:

"We see no infirmity in the judgment of the Tribunal under appeal. No error with the reasoning and the conclusion reached therein. We are, however, of the view that the Tribunal has not justified in granting arrears of House Rent Allowance to the respondents from May 18, 1986. The respondents are entitled to the arrears only with effect from October 1, 1986 when the recommendation of the IVth Central Pay Commission were enforced. We direct accordingly and modify the order of the Tribunal to that extent. The appeal, therefore, disposed of. No costs."

From the judgment of the Apex Court quoted above, it is now well established that the employees posted in Nagaland would be entitled to get HRA as indicated in the aforesaid judgment.

4. The said judgment relates to the employees of the Telecommunication and Postal Department. Later on, the civilian employees of the Defence Department as well as employees of the other departments of the Central Government who were not paid HRA, therefore, being aggrieved by the action of the

respondents.....

respondents in refusing to give the benefit of the HRA in terms of the judgment of the Apex Court quoted above, some employees approached this Tribunal by filing several original applications. All the applications were disposed of by this Tribunal by a common order dated 22.8.1995. In the said order this Tribunal allowed the original applications and directed the respondents to pay HRA to those applicants. The Tribunal, in the aforesaid order, among others observed as follows:

"1.(a) House rent allowance at the rate applicable to the Central Government employees in 'B' (B1-B2) class cities/towns for the period from 1.10.1986 or actual date of posting in Nagaland if it is subsequent thereto, as the case may be upto 28.2.1991 and at the rate as may be applicable from time to time as from 1.3.1991 onwards and continue to pay the same."

Thereafter the civilian employees of Defence Department also claimed HRA on the basis of the said judgment of the Apex Court and circular dated 23.9.1986 by moving various applications, namely, O.A.No.124/95 and O.A.No.125/95. This Tribunal by yet another common order dated 24.8.1995 passed in O.A.Nos.124/95 and 125/95 allowed the applications directing the respondents to pay HRA to the Defence civilian employees posted in Nagaland in the same manner as ordered on 22.8.1995 above. These orders were, however, challenged by the respondents before the Apex Court and the said appeals alongwith some other appeals were disposed of by the Apex Court in C.A.No.1592 of 1997 dealing with Special (Duty) Allowance and other allowances. However, the Apex Court did not make any reference to HRA in the order dated 17.2.1997. Therefore, it is now settled that the employees posted in Nagaland are entitled to HRA.

5. In view of the above and in the line of the Apex Court judgment and this Tribunal's order dated 22.8.1995 passed in O.A.Nos.48/91 and others we hold that all the applicants in the above original applications are entitled to HRA at the rate applicable.....

applicable to the Central Government employees of 'B' class of cities and towns for the period from 1.10.1986 or from the actual date of posting in Nagaland if the posting is subsequent to the said date, as the case may be, upto 28.2.1991 and at the rate as may be applicable from time to time from 1.3.1991 onwards and continue to pay the same till the said notification is in force.

6. Accordingly we direct the respondents to pay the applicants HRA as above and this must be done as early as possible, at any rate within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the order.

7. In O.A.Nos.91/96, 87/96, 190/96, 191/96, 45/97, 192/96, 197/96 and 55/97, the applicants have also claimed 10% compensation in lieu of rent free accommodation. The learned counsel for the applicants submit that this Tribunal in O.A.No.48/91 and others have already granted such compensation. Mr S. Ali learned Sr. C.G.S.C. and Mr G. Sarma, learned Addl. C.G.S.C., do not dispute the same.

8. We have gone through the order dated 22.8.1995 passed in O.A.No.48/91 and others. In the said order this Tribunal, among others, passed the following order:

"2.(a) Licence fee at the rate of 10% of monthly pay (subject to where it was prescribed at a lesser rate depending upon the extent of basic pay) with effect from 1.7.1987 or actual date of posting in Nagaland if it is subsequent thereto, as the case may be, upto date and continue to pay the same until the concession is not withdrawn or modified by the Government of India or till rent free accommodation is not provided."

The aforesaid judgment covers the present cases also. Accordingly, we hold that the applicants are entitled to get the compensation in lieu of rent free accommodation in the manner indicated

in.....

in the said order.

9. Accordingly we direct the respondents to pay to the applicants 10% compensation in lieu of rent free accommodation as above. This must be done as early as possible, at any rate, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order.

10. All the applications are accordingly disposed of. However, considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case we make no order as to costs.

Sd/- VICE CHAIRMAN

Sd/- MEMBER (A)

nk m