

✓

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH
GUWAHATI-05

(DESTRUCTION OF RECORD RULES, 1990)

INDEX

✓
O.A/T.A No. 319/2007

R.A/C.P No.

E.P/M.A No.

1. Orders Sheet..... OAPg. 1to. X.....
2. Judgment/Order dtd 04.10.2008Pg. 1to. 3..... 8/10.....
3. Judgment & Order dtd.....Received from H.C/Supreme Court
4. O.A..... 319/2007Pg. 1to. 40.....
5. E.P/M.P.....Pg.....to.....
6. R.A/C.P.....Pg.....to.....
7. W.S.....Pg.....to.....
8. Rejoinder.....Pg.....to.....
9. Reply.....Pg.....to.....
10. Any other Papers.....Pg.....to.....
11. Memo of Appearance.....
12. Additional Affidavit.....
13. Written Arguments.....
14. Amendment Reply by Respondents.....
15. Amendment Reply filed by the Applicant.....
16. Counter Reply.....

SECTION OFFICER (Judl.)

Salita
11.10.17

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH:

1. Original Application NO. 319/2007

2. MiBs Petition No. _____

3. Contempt Petition No. _____

4. Review Application No. _____

Applicant(S) Mr. Umesh Prasad VS Union of India & Crs

Advocate for the Applicants Rajesh Mazumdar

Advocate for the Respondant(S) CGSE

Notes of the Registry	Date	Order of the Tribunal
<p>This application is in form is filed/C.F. for Rs. 50/- deposited vide IPO/DO No. 64E395052, 66F831988 Dated 9.11.07.</p>	04.01.2008	<p>Judgment pronounced in open Court. Kept in separate sheets. Application is disposed of. No order as to costs.</p>

By Registrar

[Signature]

(Khushiram)
Member(A)

(M.R. Mohanty)
Vice-Chairman

Petitioner's Cris bar
issue notices are
received with envelopes.
Copy not served.

Lm

[Signature]
11/1/08

Received copy at order dated
4.1.08 for applicants
advocates
utal Malakar
10/01/08

18.3.08
and vide D/NOS.
201 to 204 dated 17.1.08
gh

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH

.....

Original Application No. 319/2007

DATE OF DECISION : 04-01-2008

Shri Umesh Prasad

.....Applicant/s

Mr.RajeshMazumdar.....

.....Advocate for the

Applicant/s

-Versus -

Union of India & Ors.

.....Respondent/s

Miss U. Das, Addl.C.G.S.C.

.....Advocate for the
Respondent/s

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR MANORANJAN MOHANTY, VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE MR KHUSHIRAM, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? Yes/No[✓]
2. Whether to be referred to the Reporter or not ? Yes/No[✓]
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ? Yes/No[✓]

Vice-Chairman/Mamber(A)

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, GUWAHATI BENCH

Original Application No.319 of 2007

Date of Order: This the 4th Day of January, 2008

HON'BLE MR.MONORANJAN MOHANTY, VICE-CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR.KHUSHIRAM, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Pharmacist Umesh Prasad
Force no 841520041
9 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force,
Presently posted at ADNagar, Agartala,
Tripura (West)-799012.

.Applicant.

By Advocate Mr.Rajesh Mazumdar

-Versus-

1. The Union of India, Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs
New Delhi.
2. The Director General of Police,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Lodhi Road, CGO Complex
New Delhi-110003.
3. The Director (Medical) Directorate
General Central Reserve Police Force,
East Block, 10 R.K. Puram
New Delhi-110066.
4. The Commandant, 9th Battalion, Central
Reserve Police Force, Presently posted
at AD Nagar, Agartala
Tripura (West)

Respondents.


By Advocate Ms. Usha Das, Addl.C.G.S.C

ORDER (ORAL)

M.R.MOHANTY,V.C:

Heard Mr.Rajesh Mazumdar, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant and Ms. Usha Das, learned Addl. Standing counsel appearing for the Union of India, on whom copy of this Original Application has already been served.

2. The Applicant, a CRPF Hospital Staff, has filed this Original Application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985,



with a prayer for direction to the Respondents to grant him the Hospital Patient Care Allowance for a period prior to 08.09.2000. The case of the Applicant is that he is getting Patient Care Allowance with effect from 08.09.2000; only.

3. It appears that the Applicant did not raise any grievances, as yet, before the Respondents to grant him Patient Care Allowance for the period prior to 08.09.2000. Existence of a grievance/right is not enough to rush to the Court/Tribunal. One must approach the authorities, at the first instance, to get redressal of his grievance. Only when the authorities neglect to redress the grievances or refuse to redress the law-ful grievances, then only one should approach the Court/Tribunal for intervention. Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 also requires that one must approach the authorities, for redressal of his grievances, before approaching this Tribunal.

4. The Applicant has filed the present case, as it appears, without raising any grievance before the Respondents /competent authorities for grant of arrears of Hospital Care Allowance for the period between 01-08.1987 to 07-09-2000.


5. In the aforesaid premises, this O.A is, hereby, disposed of, at the Admission stage, by granting liberty to the Applicant to raise his grievances before the Respondents/competent authorities and, if any such grievances are raised, by way of filing representation, by end of January, 2008, then the Respondents should give due consideration of the same.

6. Copies of this order be sent to the Respondents, along with the copies of this Original Application, in the address given in this O.A. and the Respondents should (a) treat the copy of this O.A as a representation




(of the Applicant) to the Respondents; (b) consider the same in terms of the Rules/Govt. instructions and (c) pass necessary consequential order, as due and admissible under the rules, by end of March, 2008.

7. Also send copies of this order to the Applicant in the address given in the O.A. and to the counsels appearing for the parties.


(KHUSHIRAM)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER


(M.R. MOHANTY)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

LM



IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: GUWAHATI BENCH: GUWAHATI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO...../2007

Pharmacist Umesh Prasad

-Vs-


Union of India and others.

SYNOPSIS

The present application has been filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The applicant is a non-combatised pharmacist attached with the 9th Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force and is presently posted at Tripura. The applicant has been drawing Patient Care Allowance since 8-9-2000 till date. It is stated that different benches of the Central Administrative Tribunal, the High Courts and also the Supreme Court has upheld the entitlement of the hospital staff of the Central Reserve Police Force to Patient Care Allowance as per OM dated 25-1-1988, which was later revised by OM dated 28-9-1998, 2-1-1999. The Respondents have not paid the allowance to the applicant for the period 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000. It is stated that the respondents have taken a specific stand that the Patient care allowance for the said period would be made available to only those persons who would approach the Hon'ble Courts and obtain orders. It is stated that the Hon'ble Hyderabad Bench and the Hon'ble Bench of this Tribunal has disposed of petitions filed by similarly situated persons praying for a similar relief as prayed for in this application, based on similar grounds, by directing the respondents to pay the patient care allowance to the applicants therein for the period from 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000 at the applicable rates. The applicant therefore prays that this Hon'ble Tribunal would be pleased to issue directions to the respondents to pay the patient care allowance to the applicant for the period of 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000.


Filed by

Rajesh Mazumdar
(RAJESH MAZUMDAR)
ADVOCATE,
(Counsel for the applicant)



LIST OF DATES AND EVENTS

- 25-01-1988 The Government of India sanctioned Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group C and D Non-Ministerial Staff of Central Govt. Hospital.
- 28-09-1998, The rates of the aforesaid allowance were
02-01-1999 revised.
- 12-03-1996 Civil Rule 1417/95 disposed of granting Hospital Patient Care Allowance to medical staff of Central Reserve Police Force.
- 10-06-1996 OA No. 09/1995 disposed of by this Hon'ble Tribunal upholding the right of Non-combatatised employees to the allowance.
- 17-10-2001 Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed Civil Appeal No. 11985/96 and 1093/95 filed by Central Reserve Police Force and thereby confirmed eligibility of paramedical staff of Central Reserve Police Force to Hospital Patient Care Allowance.



The applicant is being paid HPCA from 8-9-2000 onwards. The allowance from 1.8.1987 to till 7-9-2000 has not yet been paid.

05-08-2005


Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad bench, disposed of OA No. 243/05 filed by similarly placed hospital staff directing the Central Reserve Police Force to pay Hospital Patient Care Allowance from 01-08-1987 or from his date of appointment whichever is later as per order dated 25-01-1988 and as revised by order dated 28-09-1998 and any subsequent order.

5-7-2007

This Hon'ble Tribunal disposed of OA no 296/2006 and OA No. 314/2006, which were filed seeking similar relief on similar grounds, directing the respondents to sanction the patient Care Allowance to the applicants therein for the period 1.8.1987 to till 7-9-2000.

12-10-2007

Applicant was permitted to withdraw from OA No. 277/2007, filed before this Hon'ble Tribunal, wherein he had been arrayed as Applicant No. 4, with liberty to file fresh Original Application



10

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: GUWAHATI BENCH:
GUWAHATI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO...../2007

Pharmacist Umesh Prasad

-Vs-

The Union of India and others

INDEX

<u>SL. Nos.</u>	<u>Description of documents</u>	<u>Page nos.</u>
1.	APPLICATION WITH VERIFICATION	1 TO 14
2.	True Copy of letter dated 25.1.88	(Annexure A1) 15
3.	True Copy of the letter dated 28.9.98	(Annexure A2) 16
4.	True Copy of the letter dated 2. 1. 99	(Annexure A3) 17
5.	Copy of the order-dated 12.3.96 passed in civil rule No. 1417/95	(Annexure A4) 18 to 19
6.	Copy of the order dated 18.3.02 passed in writ Appeal No. 155/97	(Annexure A5) 20 to 21
7.	Copy of the order dated 30-9-2004 passed in WP(c) no 474/2003	(Annexure A6) 22 to 23
8.	True copy of order dated 22/10/2005	(Annexure A7) 24
9.	True copy of the order dated 5-8-2005	(Annexure A8) 25 to 29
10.	True copy of the order dated 5-7-2007	(Annexure A9) 30 to 39
11.	True copy of order dated 12-10-2007	(Annexure A10) 40
12.	VAKALATNAMA	

FILED BY

Rajesh Mazumdar
(RAJESH MAZUMDAR)
ADVOCATE.

5, Pub-Sarania Road, Chandmari, Guwahati-3

31 DEC 2007

गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL GUWAHATI BENCH:
GUWAHATI

(An application under section 19 of the Central Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO...../2007

Pharmacist Umesh Prasad
Force no 841520041
9 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force,
Presently posted at AD Nagar, Agartala, Tripura (West).

.....Applicant

-Vs-

1. The Union of India, Through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.
2. The Director General Of police, Central Reserve Police Force, Lodhi Road, CGO Complex, New Delhi-110003.
3. The Director (Medical) Directorate General, Central Reserve Police Force, East Block, 10, R.K. Puram New Delhi, 110066.
4. The Commandant, 9th Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force, presently posted at AD Nagar, Agartala, Tripura (West).

..... Respondents


DETAILS OF THE APPLICATION:

1. Particulars of the orders against which the application is made.

This application is made against the non-payment of the Hospital Patient Care allowance to the applicants for the period from 1.8.1987 to till 7-9-2000, though they are legally entitled to the same and similarly placed personnel have been given the same. It is stated that the respondents have taken a consistent stand that payment cannot be made to those person who do not obtain orders from the Hon'ble Courts.

Umesh Prasad

11
Filed by the applicant.
Through Rajesh Nayak, Advocate, Guwahati.



2. Jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

The applicants declare that the subject matter of this application is within the Jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Tribunal and that the applicants are serving within the territorial jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court.

3. Limitation

The applicant further declares that the application is within the limitation period prescribed in Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and as per law laid down by the various Courts of law.


4. Facts of the case.

4.1. The applicant respectfully states that he is a non-combatised pharmacist serving in the Central Reserve Police Force (hereinafter referred to as the "Force") and he joined the services in the year 1984. The applicant further states that he is attached to the 9 Battalion of the Force and presently deployed in the State of Tripura, which falls under the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal.

4.2. The applicant states that in addition to salary he is entitled to all the benefits and allowances as are applicable to the Nursing personnel and Hospital Staff serving in the other Central Government Health Services. As such, the applicant is also entitled to Patient Care Allowance at the same rate as is applicable to the nursing Personnel serving under the Central Reserve Police Force and other Central Health Services.

4.3 The applicant states that the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare vide letter dated 25.1.88 conveyed the sanction of the president of the grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance

Umash Prasad.



to Group " C " and " D " non Ministerial employees including drivers of ambulance cars, but excluding the staff Nurses @ Rs- 80/- and Rs. 75/- per month respectively with effect from 1.2.89 subject to the condition that no night weight age allowance if sanctioned by the Central Government, will be admissible to these employees working in the Central Government hospitals and hospitals under the Delhi Administration. The aforesaid letter was issued with the concurrence of Ministry of Finance vide their DO NO. 1167/ PM/ 87 dated 15.10.87.


Copy of letter dated 25.1.88 of the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare is annexed herewith and marked **ANNEXURE A1**.

4.4 The applicant states that the scheme of granting Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the Group " C " and " D " (Non- Ministerial Hospital employees) was later on revised by yet another communication of the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare dated 28.9.98. Pursuant to the aforesaid communication, the rates of Hospital Patient Care allowance care were revised from Rs 80 /-per month to Rs. 160/- per month in the case of Group " C ' non- Ministerial Hospital staff and from Rs. 75/- per month to Rs. 150/- per month in the case of Group "D', Non- Ministerial Hospital employees.

Copy of the letter of the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family welfare dated 28.9.98 is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE A2**.

4.5 The applicant states that the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family welfare by yet another communication dated 2.1.99

Amish Prasad




further revised the rate of Hospital Patient Care Allowance from Rs. 160/- per month to Rs. 700/- per month in the case of Group- C employees (Non- Ministerial) working in Central Government Hospitals and Hospitals under National Capital Territory Of Delhi and other Union Territories and from Rs. 150/- per month to Rs. 695/- per month in the case Group " D' employees (Non- Ministerial) working in Central Government hospitals and under the Delhi and other union Territories.

Copy of the letter of the Government of India,
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare dated
2. 1. 99 is annexed herewith and marked as
ANNEXURE A3.

4.6 The applicant states that certain non-combatised Para-medical staff of CRPF working in some Base Hospital approached the Principal Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi stating that though the Para-medical staff of the Force working in Bhubaneswar Hospital are being granted the Hospital Patient Care Allowance, but they are not given the said benefit. The Principal Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal while allowing the application held that it would be discriminatory if the Paramedical staff in working in Bhubaneswar Hospital of the Force received the benefit of the allowance and the other similar paramedical staff working in other hospital are not extended the same benefit. Consequently the Ld. Tribunal directed that all the Applicants in the Original Application who are paramedical staff should be granted Hospital Patient Care Allowance at the appropriate rate from the relevant date as per Government of India's instruction dated 25.1.88 and 28.9.98 subject to the conditions stated therein.

Unish Prasad.



4.7 The applicant states that like the Principal Bench of Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi, another order was passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench, to the same effect.


4.8 The applicant states that placing reliance on the aforesaid two orders of the Principal Bench, Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi and Hyderabad Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal, 24 numbers of paramedical staff of Base Hospital, Group center, CRPF, Amerigog, Guwahati-23 approached this Hon'ble Court in Civil Rule No- 1417/95. The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 12.3.96 allowed the writ petition with the direction that all the applicants of the Civil Rule who are paramedical staff should get Hospital Patient Care Allowance as per instruction of the Government of India dated 25.1.88 subject to the condition mentioned therein. It was also directed to implement the order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the order.

Copy of the order-dated 12.3.96 passed by the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court in civil rule No. 1417/95 is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE A4.**

4.9 The applicant states that this Hon'ble Tribunal in OA no 9/1995, vide order dated 10th day of June 1996 had also upheld the right of the Civilian Employees of working under the Hospitals of the Central Reserve Police Force to the hospital Patient Care allowance in accordance with OM No Z.28015/60/87-H dated 25-1-1988.

4.10 The applicant states that the Union of India had filed a SLP Civil Appeal no 11985 of 1996 and 1093 of 1995 before the Supreme Court of

Unesh Prasad



India challenging the orders passed the Principal Bench and the Hyderabad Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal. The respondents had agitated the question of law as to whether the paramedical staff of the Central Reserve Police Force would be entitled to the benefit of Patient Care Allowance. The Supreme Court vide its order dated 17-10-2001 has dismissed the Appeals filed by the respondents. The issue of the eligibility of the paramedical staff to the patient care allowance has been decided in the affirmative by the Supreme Court vide its order dated 17-10-2001

4.11 The applicant states that similar issue came up in another form before the Division Bench of the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court in Writ Appeal NO. 155/97. The aforesaid Writ Appeal was allowed by the Hon'ble Court vide order dated 18.3.2002 mentioning the fact that the special Leave petition preferred before the Hon'ble Supreme Court challenging the legality of the payment of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the paramedical staff of the Force was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Copy of the order of the Hon'ble Court dated 18.3.02 passed in writ Appeal No. 155/97 is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE- A5.**

4.12 The applicant states that the entitlement of the Group C and D (non-ministerial) Civilian Employees working in the Hospitals of the Central Reserve Police Force at par with the Hospital staff working serving in the Central Health Services is no longer Res - integra and has been settled by several decisions of the Ld. Administrative Tribunals, the High

Amish Prasad.

31 DEC 2007

গুৱাহাটী ন্যায়পীঠ
Gauhati Bench

7

Courts and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This fact is also reflected in the order dated 30-9-2004 passed by the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court in WP (c) no. 474/2003, in which the non-payment of hospital Patient Care allowance to similarly placed combatised hospital staff of the Central Reserve Police Force was deprecated by the Hon'ble Court.

A True copy of the order dated 30-9-2004 passed in WP(c) no 474/2003 is annexed hereto as **ANNEXURE A6**.

4.13 The applicant states that the applicant in the present ~~Original~~ application is drawing the benefit of Hospital Patient Care Allowance with effect from 8/9/2000. The allowance for the period from 1-8-1987 to 8-9-2000 has not yet been paid to the applicant for reasons best known to the respondents.

4.14 The applicant states that that other similarly situated civilian personnel working in the Hospitals run by the Central Reserve Police Force have been allowed the hospital Patient Care Allowance at the rates applicable to them from 1-8-1987 as per the circular dated 25-1-1988 and subsequent circulars enhancing/revising the rate of Hospital Patient Care Allowance as applicable to them.

4.15 The applicant states that similarly situated personnel had placed their claim for entitlement of Hospital Patient Care allowance from October 1987 as per circular dated 25-1-1988 and/or from their date of appointment, which ever is later.

Amish Prasad

31 DEC 2005

मुंबई न्यायाधीश

4.16 The applicant states that by an order dated 22/10/2005 the Chief


Medical Officer of the respective Base Hospital had informed that there were no orders for payment of patient Care Allowance to personnel other than those who have got orders in favor of them from the Court. The personnel therein were in fact asked to submit claims with Hon'ble Courts favorable decision.

A true copy of the order dated 22/10/2005 is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE A7.**

4.17 The applicant states that OA no 243/2005 was filed by a Hospital staff before the Ld. Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench praying for a direction to the respondents to sanction Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the applicant from the period 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000 as per the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India, vide letters dated 28-9-1998 and 2-1-1999 as had been done in respect of similarly situated employees. The Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 5-8-2005 was pleased to direct the respondents to pay the applicant the Hospital Patient Care Allowance from 1-8-1987 or from the date of his appointment, whichever is later, at the rates of allowance sanctioned to Group C and D non-ministerial hospital employees by order dated 25-1-1988 and revised by order dated 28-9-1998 and subsequent orders of revision of the allowance.

A copy of the order dated 5-8-2005 passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE A8.**

Umesh Prasad.



4.18 The applicant states that similarly situated Pharmacists and other hospital staff had filed OA no 296/2005 and OA No 314/2006 before this Tribunal, praying for a directions to the respondents to sanction Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the applicant for the period 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000 as per the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India, vide letters dated 28-9-1998 and 2-1-1999 as had been done in respect of similarly situated employees and as had been directed by the Hyderabad Bench of the Hon'ble Tribunal. This Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 5-7-2007 was pleased to direct the respondents to pay the applicants therein Hospital Patient Care Allowance from 1-8-1987 or from the date of appointment, whichever is later, at the rates of allowance sanctioned to Group C and D non-ministerial hospital employees by order dated 25-1-1988 and revised by order dated 28-9-1998 and subsequent orders of revision of the allowance.

A copy of the order dated 5-7-2007 passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE A9**.

5. Grounds for relief with legal provisions

The applicant is challenging the action of the respondents in not paying Hospital Patient Care to the applicant from 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000 as per revised rates sanctioned vide orders dated 28-9-1998 and 2-1-1999 on the following amongst other

Grounds.

5.1 For that the impugned actions of the respondents are illegal and arbitrary and are without application of mind and, as such, are not tenable in Law.

Prakash Prasad

5.2 For that the question of entitlement of the applicants to Hospital Patient care allowance as per order dated 25-1-1988 and subsequent OM on the issue is no longer res- Integra but is a settled position of law. The respondents are acting illegally in denying the applicants the due benefit from the date from they were entitled to the benefit, i.e. 1-8-1987 or their date of appointment whichever ever is later.


5.3 For that the respondents have acted illegally and arbitrarily when they have taken a stand that since the applicants have not approached the Court of Law, they would not be entitled to the benefit as is being given to other similarly situated persons.

5.4 For that the action of the respondents in denying the applicants the benefit of an allowance which is allowed to other similarly situated persons is in clear violation of the principles of the equality and as such the respondents are liable to directed by this Hon'ble Court to grant the Hospital Patient Care allowance to the applicants from 1-8-1987 or from the date of their appointment whichever is later in accordance with the circulars passed by the Government of India in this regard.

5.5 For that the respondents have acted in gross violation of the principles of "equal pay for equal work " when they have denied the benefit of Hospital patient Care Allowance to the applicants from the same date as given to other similarly situated persons.

5.6 For that it is humbly submitted that the entitlement of the applicants would arise from the date since when other similarly situated persons are drawing the allowance.

Chunsh Prasad



5.7 For that it is submitted that since the entitlement of Group C and D persons working in the hospitals of the Central Reserve Police force to the HPCA/PCA has already been settled by Courts of law, the act of the respondents in attempting to curtail the entitlement is without any force and against all canons of law.

6. **DETAILS OF REMEDIES EXHAUSTED: -**

The applicant states that in view of the stand taken by the respondents in the case of other similarly situated personnel, there is no other alternative and efficacious remedy available to the applicants except invoking the Jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act. 1985.

7. **MATTERS NOT PREVIOUSLY FILED OR PENDING WITH ANY OTHER COURT:**

The applicant declares that he was a party in OA No. 277/07 filed before this Hon'ble Tribunal with a similar cause of action and praying for a similar relief. However he was granted the liberty to withdraw from the OA 277 / 07, with liberty to file fresh Original Application. It is stated that no other application, writ petition or suit is pending before any of Court or Tribunal.


A true copy of the order dated 12-10-2007 is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure A10.**

8. **RELIEF SOUGHT FOR:**

Under the facts and circumstances stated above the applicants most respectfully pray that your Lordships may be pleased to grant the following reliefs to the applicant.

8.1 Direct the respondents to sanction the Hospital Patient Care allowance to the applicants for the period from 1-8-1987 to 7-9-2000 as the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India vide orders dated 28-9-1998 and 2-1-1999, as has been done in

Unish Prasad



respect of similarly situated employees by declaring the action of the respondents in not paying the Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the applicants for the period to be arbitrary, discriminatory and illegal; and

8.2 Grant the cost of this application in favor of the applicants and against the respondents; and

8.3 To grant such further or other reliefs as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit, proper and necessary in the interests of justice and in the circumstances of the case.

9. Interim order, if any, prayed for :

The applicant has not filed any prayer for interim relief.


10. In the event of application being sent by Registered post, it may be stated whether the applicant desires to have oral hearing at the admission stage and if so, he shall attach a self addressed Post-Card or Inland Letter, at which intimation regarding the date of hearing could be sent to him.

The applicant states that clause 10 of the statutory format does not apply to him.

11. PARTICULARS OF BANK DRAFT/POSTAL ORDER IN RESPECT OF THE APPLICATION FEE

- (i) I P O number: 64E 395052, 66F 831988, 66F 831985
- (ii) Date: 11-9-02.
- (iii) Issued by the Guwahati post office
- (iv) Payable at Guwahati.

Amresh Prasad




12. LIST OF ENCLOSURES:

1. True Copy of letter dated 25.1.88..... (Annexure A1)
2. True Copy of the letter dated 28.9.98..... (Annexure A2)
3. True Copy of the letter dated 2. 1. 99 (Annexure A3)
4. Copy of the order-dated 12.3.96 passed in civil rule No. 1417/95.. (Annexure A4)
5. Copy of the order dated 18.3.02 passed in writ Appeal No. 155/97
..... (Annexure A5)
6. Copy of the order dated 30-9-2004 passed in WP(c) no 474/2003
..... (Annexure A6)
7. True copy of order dated 22/10/2005 (Annexure A7)
8. True copy of the order dated 5-8-2005 (Annexure A8)
9. True copy of the order dated 5-7-2007 (Annexure A9)
10. True copy of order dated 12-10-2007 - (Annexure A10).

---VERIFICATION---

Unsubscribed.

**VERIFICATION**

I, Force No. 841520041, Pharmacist Umesh Prasad, s/o Parameshwar Prasad, aged about 44 years, working as a non-combatised Pharmacist in the Central Reserve Police Force, presently attached with 9 Battalion, posted at A D Nagar, Agartala, Tripura (West), do hereby verify that the contents of paragraphs number 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12..... are true to my personal knowledge and the contents of paragraphs 2, 3, 5..... believed to be true on legal advice and that I have not suppressed any material fact.

Date: 15/11/2007

Place: ^{Tripura (West)}
~~Guwahati~~

Umesh Prasad

Signature of the applicant.

ANNEXURE-A1

No. 2.28015/60/87-H

Government of India


Ministry of Health & Family Welfare

Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.

Dated the 25th January 1988

To

1. The Director General of Health Services.
Nirman Bhawan.
New Delhi
2. The Secretary (Medical), Delhi Administration
P. Samnath Marg
Delhi-110054.



Subject: Grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group 'c' and 'D' (Non-Ministerial) hospital employees.

Sir,

With reference to DOMS no B.12017/3/87-MH dated 9.4.87 on the subject mentioned above, I am directed to convey the sanction of the President to the grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group 'c' and 'D' (Non-Ministerial) hospital employees including Drivers of Ambulance Cars, but excluding Staff Nurses, at the rate of Rs. 80/- and Rs. 75/- per month respectively with effect from 1.2.89, subject to the condition that no night weightage allowance, if sanctioned by the Central Government, will be admissible to those employees working in the Central Government Hospitals and Hospitals under the Delhi Administration.

2. The expenditure involved will be met out of the budget grant of the concerned Hospital during the financial year i.e. 1987-88.

3. This issues with the concurrency of the Ministry of Finance vide their Dy. No. 1167/FS/27 dated 15.10.1987.

Yours faithfully,

sd/- illegible

Under Secretary to the Government of India.

This is a true copy of the Original Document

Rajesh Chandra
Adm.
17/1/07.


ANNEXURE-A2

Government of India
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare

Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
Dated the 28th September 1998

To

1. The Director General of Health Services.
Nirman Bhawan.
New Delhi
2. The Director.
Central Government Health Scheme.
Nirman Bhawan.
New Delhi.



Subject: Revision of rate Hospital Patient Care Allowance/ patient
Care Allowance.

Sir.

I am Directed to convey the sanction of the president of revise the rate of Hospital patient Care Allowances payable to Group "C" and "D" (Non-Ministerial) Hospital employees and patient Care Allowance payable to Group "C" and "D" (Non-Ministerial) CGHS employees w.e.f. 1.8.1987. The revised rates will be as under:

1. Group "C" (Non-Ministerial) Hospital employees From Rs. 80/- p.m. to Rs. 160/- p.m.
2. Group "D" (Non-Ministerial) Hospital employees From Rs. 75/- p.m. to Rs. 150/- p.m.
3. Group "C" & "D" (Non-Ministerial) CGHS employees From Rs. 70/- p.m. to Rs. 140/- p.m.

2. The terms and conditions for payment of Hospital patient Care Allowance/ patient Care Allowance will remain the same as mentioned in this Ministry's letter No. B. 28015/60/ 87-H dated 25.1.1988. Z.28015/102/ 88-H dated 30.10.1989 and B-11011/1/90-CGHS dated 10.7.90.

3. The expenditure involved will be met out of the budge grant of concerned hospitals/CGHS Organisation for the year 1998-99.

Your faithfully.

Sd/- Illegible.

UNDER SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

This is a true Copy of the Original Document

Rajesh Kumar
Adv.
17/11.


ANNEXURE-A3

No. 2.28015/41/90-H (I)

Government of India
Ministry of Health & Family WelfareNirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
Dated the 02nd January 1999

To

1. The Director General of Health Services,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi
2. The Director,
Central Government Health Scheme,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.



Subject: Revision of rate Hospital Patient Care Allowance/ patient
Care Allowance.

Sir.

I am Directed to convey the sanction of the president of revise the rate of Hospital patient Care Allowances payable to Group "C" and "D" (Non- Ministerial). Hospital employees and patient Care Allowance payable to Group "C" and D" (Non- Ministerial) employees working in CGHS Dispensaries w.e.f. 29th December 1998. The revised rates will be as under:

1. Group "C" (Non- Ministerial) working in Central Government hospitals and hospitals under the National Capital Territory of Delhi and other Union Territories. From Rs. 160/- per month to Rs. 700/- per month
2. Group "D" (Non- Ministerial) working in Central Government hospitals and hospitals under the National Capital Territory of Delhi and other Union Territories. From Rs. 150/- per month to Rs. 695/- per month
3. Group "C" & "D" (Non- Ministerial) CGHS employees working in CGHS Dispensaries From Rs. 140/- per month to Rs. 690/- per month.
2. The terms and conditions for payment of Hospital patient Care Allowance/ patient Care Allowance will remain the same as mentioned in this Ministry's letter No. B. 28015/60/ 87-H dated 25th January 1988, Z.28015/102/ 88-H dated 30th October 1989 and B-11011/1/90-CGHS (P) dated 10th July 90.
3. The expenditure involved will be met out of the budget grant of concerned hospitals/CGHS Organization.
4. This issues with the disposal of Ministry of Fin. (Department of Expenditure) vide D.O. No. 19050/1/98.E IV dated 05 December 1998.

Sd/-

(LAL SINGH.)

UNDER SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA.

This is a true copy of the Original Document

Rajesh Nagar
Sd/-
17/11.

ANNEXURE A4

IN THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(THE HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MEGHALAYA, MANIPUR, TRIPURA,
MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

CIVIL RULE NO. 1417/95

Sri Nikunja Das and ors.Petitioners


-versus-

Union of India and Anr. Respondents.

P R E S E N T
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.N.SARMA.

For the Petitioner : Mr. S. Dutta, Mr. K.K.Dey

For the Respondent : C.G.S.C.



Date 12.3.96

ORDER

This case has been filed by 24 persons, all employees of G C CRPF, Hospital, working in different hospitals whereby they claim that the Respondents may be directed to pay to them the Hospital patient care allowance as per the Government instruction dated 25-1-88, Annexure I including the arrear allowances Annexure I is quoted below:

" Subject: Grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group 'c' and 'D' (Non-Ministerial) hospital employees.

Sir,

With reference to DOMS no B.12017/3/87-MH dated 9.4.87 on the subject mentioned above, I am directed to convey the sanction of the President to the grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group 'c' and 'D' (Non-Ministerial) hospital employees including Drivers of Ambulance Cars, but excluding Staff Nurses, at the rate of Rs. 80/- and Rs. 75/- per month respectively with effect from 1.2.89, subject to the condition that no night weightage allowance, if sanctioned by the Central Government, will be admissible to those employees working in the Central Government Hospitals and Hospitals under the Delhi Administration.

2. The expenditure involved will be met out of the budget grant of the concerned Hospital during the financial year i.e. 1987-88.

3. This issues with the concurrency of the Ministry of Finance vide their

Dy. No. 1167/FS/27 dated 15.10.1987. "

This is a true copy of the Original Document
Rajiv Mahanta
Advocate
12/11

In this case there was an order on the same matter by the Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi wherein paragraph -6 the Central Administrative Tribunal pointed out as follows:

"6. it would be discriminatory if paramedical staff working in Bhubaneshwar Hospital, CRPF receive the benefit of this allowance and the other similar paramedical staff working in other hospitals and who have filed this application are not extended the same benefit. Accordingly it would be fit and proper to direct that all those applicants in this OA who are paramedical staff should be granted hospital patient care allowance at the appropriate rate from the relevant date as per Govt. of India instructions dated 25.1.1988 and 28.2.1990 subject to the conditions stated therein. This order should be implemented within a period of three months from the time of receipt of the copy of this order. There will be no order as to costs."

To the same effect there was an order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad. It is admitted by Shri K. N. Choudhury that there are such orders. But he submitted that he has filed an appeal before the Supreme Court and in that appeal a notice has been issued and the matter is now pending before the Apex Court. Sri Dutta, learned advocate for the Petitioner submits that he is willing to give an undertaking on behalf of his client that the same order may be passed in this case subject to the result of the appeal pending before the Apex Court. Accordingly this writ application is allowed with the direction it would be fit and proper to direct that all the applicants in this Civil Rule, who are paramedical staff should get hospital patient care allowance as per instruction of the Government of India dated 25.1.88 subject to the condition mentioned therein. This order should be implemented within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of this order. The petitioners may obtain certified copy of this order to produce the same before the authority to do the needful in terms of this order.

It is made clear that the petitioners are paramedical staff but they are working in different hospitals.

This disposes of this writ application.


Sd/- JN Sarma
Judge.

ANNEXURE A5

IN THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(THE HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MEGHALAYA, MANIPUR, TRIPURA,
MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

WRIT APPEAL NO 155 OF 1997

1. Sri Chandra Sekhar Pandey.
2. Sri Siba Kumar Baruah
3. Sri Mukesh Kumar
4. Sri SurajBhan
5. Sri Nitya Ranjan Ojha
6. Sri Sukhdev Singh
7. Smti. Laxmi
8. Sri K Katma
9. Sri Nauratan Singh
10. Sri Dhurbha Dulal
11. Sri Ajay Kumar



Appellants no 1 to 10 are employees of
base Hospital-III, CRPF Guwahati 23.

Appellant no 11 is the employee under the
Commandant, 126 Battalion, Abhoypur,
Amingaon, Guwahati-31.

...Appellants.

-Versus-

1. The Union of India, represented by the Home Secretary,
Government of India, new Delhi.
2. The Secretary to the Government of India, ministry of Health &
Family Welfare, New Delhi.
3. The Director General, CGO Complex NO. 1, CRPF, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi.
4. The Chief medical Officer, Base Hospital No-III, 9-Mile, CRPF
Complex, Gauhati-23.
5. The Commandant, 126 Bn. CRPF, Amingaon, Guwahati-31.

.....Respondents

This is a true copy of the Original Document
- Rajesh Majumdar
Adv.
17/11/07.

89 - 10 -

- 6 -

2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
✓ Junior Scientific Assistant	14 (*Subject to variation depending on work-load).	General Central Service Group 'C' (Not-Gazetted Non-Ministerial).	Rs. 380-12-500-EB-15-560. Rs. 5000-150-8000 As per 4th Pay Commission	Not Applicable.	23-28 years (i) Relaxable for Govt. servants up to 35 years in accordance with the instructions or orders issued by Government.	A Degree in Pharmacy/Pharmaceutical Chemistry or Degree in Science with Chemistry as the principal subject.

Note : The crucial date for determining the age limit shall be the closing date for receipt of applications from candidates in India (other than Andaman & Nicobar Isl. G.S. and Lakshadweep). In case of appointment to be made through the Employment Exchanges, the crucial date for determining the age limit shall be the last date/which the Employment Exchanges are asked to submit the names.

DESIRABLE
Two years experience in testing/manufacture of drugs.
(ii) Knowledge of Botany.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal
30 SEP 2008
गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

90

- 11 -

6A

9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
Not Applicable	Two years	By direct recruitment	Not Applicable	Group 'C' D.P.C. for confirmation consisting of:- (1) Deputy Assistant Director General (Medical Store) - Chairman (2) Factory Manager / Member (3) Assistant Depot Manager / Chemist / Accounts Officer / Member (4) An outside officer from the Central Government office located at the station : Member	Not Applicable



NOTE: In the absence of Deputy Assistant Director General (Medical Store), the D.P.C. will be headed by Factory Manager / Depot Manager and in the case the proceedings will be sent to the Directorate General of Health Services for approval.

11 Feb 2008 03:14 03612471213

GHSD/GR

11 Feb 2008 03:14 03612471213

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Senior Scientific Assistant.	4* (1936)	General Central Service, Group 'B', Non-Gazetted, Non-Ministerial.	Rs. 550-25-750-EB-30-900.	Selection	Not exceeding 30 years.	No.
*Subject to variation dependent on workload.		(Relaxable for Government servants up to 5 years in accordance with the instructions or orders issued by the Central Government).				

Note: The crucial date for determining the age limit shall be the closing date for receipt of applications from candidates in India (other than those in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep).

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal
30 SEP 1988
गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

Essential

- (A)(i) Master's degree of a Chemistry/Bio-Chemistry/
Pharmacy/Pharmaceutical Chemistry or Degree
in Chemical Engineering/Chemical Technology of
a recognised University or equivalent.
(ii) One year's practical experience in the
manufacture of drugs.

OR

- (B)(i) Degree in Pharmacy or Pharmaceutical Chemistry
of a recognised University or equivalent.
(ii) 3 years practical experience after graduation
in manufacture of drugs.

OR

- (C)(i) Degree of a recognised University with Chemistry
as a Principal subject from a recognised
University or equivalent.
(ii) 5 years' practical experience in the manufacture
of drugs, after graduation.

Note 1: Qualifications are relaxable at the discretion
of the Union Public Service Commission in case of
candidates otherwise well qualified.


Note 2: The qualification(s) regarding experience is/
are relaxable at the discretion of the Union Public
Service Commission in the case of candidates belonging
to scheduled castes and Scheduled Tribes if, at any
stage of selection, the Union Public Service Commission
is of the opinion that sufficient number of candidates from
these communities possessing the requisite experience are
not likely to be available to fill up the vacancies
reserved for them.

Age: No.
Educational
Qualifica-
tion: Yes.

2 years.

(i) 75% by
promotion,
failing
which by
transfer
on depu-
tation and
failing
both by
direct
recruit-
ment.

(ii) 25%
by direct
recruit-
ment.



Promotion

Assistant Chemist with 5 years regular service in the grade.

Transfer on Deputation

Officers under the Central/State Governments:

- (a)(i) holding analogous posts; or
- (ii) with 5 years' service in posts in the scale of Rs.425-700 or equivalent; and
- (b) possessing the educational qualifications and experience prescribed for direct recruits under Column 7.

(The departmental officers in the feeder category who are in the direct line of promotion will not be eligible for consideration for appointment on deputation. Similarly deputationists shall not be eligible for consideration for appointment by promotion. Period of deputation including period of deputation in another ex-cadre post held immediately preceding this appointment in the same organisation/department shall ordinarily not exceed 3 years).

Group 'B' Departmental Promotion Committee

(for consideration of promotion and confirmation)

1. Deputy Director General (Stores) - Chairman.
2. Director (A&V) - Member
3. Assistant Director General (Stores) - Member


Consultation with the Union Public Service Commission necessary when making direct recruitment or selecting an officer for appointment or deputation.

Note: The Proceedings of the Departmental Promotion Committee relating to confirmation shall be sent to the Commission for approval, if, however, these are not approved by the Commission a fresh meeting of the Departmental Promotion Committee to be presided over by the Chairman or a Member of the Union Public Service Commission shall be held.

10

The Manager,
Government of India Press,
Maya Puri, Ring Road,
New Delhi

*M*14X*



UNDER SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA (SMT. A. KISHORE)

Ministry of Finance
Department of Expenditure
B-111 B Branch.

Ministry of Health & Family Welfare may please refer to their notes on pre pages regarding upgradation of the pay scale of the post of Junior Scientific Assistant in the Regional Drugs Testing Laboratory (RDTL), Guwahati from Rs. 4500-7000 to Rs. 5000-8000 w.e.f. 1.1.96 at par with the post of Junior Scientific Assistant of Central Indian Pharmacopoeia Laboratory (CIPL), Ghaziabad.

2. The matter has been examined in this Department and the following observations are made:

- i) Vth CPC had recommended scales of Rs. 4000-6000/Rs. 4500-7000/Rs. 5000-8000/Rs. 5500-9000 for posts carrying minimum DR qualifications of Graduate Degree (para 43.15 of the report). The post is already in the pay scale of Rs. 4500-7000.
- ii) Posts in CIPL were upgraded as the view was taken that these upgradations were broadly recommended by Vth CPC.
- iii) As per the RRs for the post of JSA in RDTL, the essential educational qualification for the post is Degree with Chemistry as one of the subject. However, the post of JSA in CIPL have Post Graduate Degree as essential qualification. Since, the essential qualification for the post of JSA in RDTL is lower than that of the post of JSA in CIPL, the pay scale at par with the post in CIPL cannot be extended to the post in RDTL.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is regretted. The Administrative Ministry may defend the case properly and bring the above indicated facts to the notice of the court.

4. This issues with the approval of JS(Per).


(Manoj Sahay)

Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India

FA(Health)

Ministry of Finance(Exp.) UO No. 6/104/99-1C dated 27.6.2008

Attested
Surjit Choudhary
Advocate



Received/brought
by hand. *[Signature]*
27/6

So/NO *[Signature]*
27/6

SW

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JN SARMA
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.A.ANSARY

Appearance for the appellants.....None


Appearance for the respondents.....Mr. P.N. Choudhury, C.G.S.C.

Date of hearing ...18/3/2002

Date of Judgment (Oral) ...18/3/2002

Hon'ble Mr. Justice J N Sarma

JUDGMENT (ORAL)



1. Earlier on 2/9/97 this Court passed the following order:-

" Learned Addl. C. G. S. C brought to our notice that the very question of law that is involved in this appeal is now being considered by the Supreme Court in SLP Civil Appeal No. 11985 of 1996 and 1093/95. By virtue of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dt. 13-9-1996 there is a stay order granted by the Supreme Court. The direction of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad for payment of allowances of the paramedical staff has been stayed. A copy of the stay order has been produced by the learned Addl C. G. S. C. Therefore, this Court may await the decision of the Supreme Court in the above cases.

In view of the foregoing reasons, the matter stands adjourned for two weeks."

2. Sri Choudhury, learned Advocate for Union of India has produced before us an order dated 17/10/2001 where-from it appeared that Supreme Court dismissed the appeal filed by Union Of India and in that view of the matter the benefit which was given by the Learned Single Judge of this Court in earlier matters which was agitated before Apex Court shall hold the field. The petitioners are working in different Hospitals and they are entitled to the same benefit.

3. Accordingly this Writ Appeal is allowed and the Writ petition, i.e. Civil Rule No 4029/96 shall also stand allowed. In Civil Rule No. 1417/95 (Niranjan Das & 23 Others, Petitioner v. Union of India, Respondent) by order dated 12/3/96, the writ petition was allowed and the same benefit was given to the writ petitioners. The order passed by the learned Single Judge in this case shall stand quashed in view of the order of disposal of the appeal by the Supreme Court.

Sd/- I A Ansari
Judge

Sd/- J N Sarma
Judge

ANNEXURE A6.

Date 30.9.2004

WP (C) No 474/03

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal

31 DEC 2004

गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.K.SHARMA

Heard Mr. S. Dutta learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. H. Rahman learned CGSC for the respondents.

The grievance made in this writ petition is in respect of non-payment of Hospital patients care allowance as per Annexure I notification dated 25.1.88 which the petitioners claim to be entitled to.

Mr. Dutta, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue is no longer res-integra and has already been decided by this Court in WP(c) No. 1417/95 (Nikunja Das and others Vs Union of India and others on 12.3.96). Mr. Dutta further submits that the said order dated 12.3.96 of this court was carried on appeal before the Apex Court and the Apex Court affirmed the said order dismissing the SLP preferred by the respondents. The SLP was dismissed by the Apex Court by order dated 17.10.2001.

The petitioner made a representation dated 15.11.02 (Annexure 8 to the writ petition) before the departmental authority asking for extension of similar benefit as was extended to other similarly situated persons who were the petitioners in Civil Rule No. 1417/95. However, the respondents took the plea that since the present petitioners were not involved in the said Writ petition i.e. Civil Rule No. 1417/95 they were not entitled to the said allowances. In fact, such a stand has been taken in the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the respondents. In Para-13 of the said affidavit-in-opposition, the respondents have stated that since the petitioners were not involved in any court cases, they were not sanctioned the said allowance. The stand of the respondents in the said affidavit-in-opposition is that as per the orders of Director (Medical) vide Signal

This is a true copy of the original Document
Rajesh Nagandan
Adv.
12/11.

No. J.II-2/2002-Med.II MHA dated 18.1.03 the aforesaid allowance to be sanctioned to the persons who were Group 'C' and 'D' combatised Hospital staff only who were petitioners of various court cases and orders for granting the said allowance had been passed by the Court. Thus the stand of the respondents is not on the ground of ineligibility of the petitioners to get the said allowance. The only ground is that, since the petitioners have not approached the court of law, they are not entitled to get similar benefit as was given to the other similarly situated persons. The principles involved in granting the aforesaid allowance have already been finalized by this court in the aforementioned Writ Petition i.e. Civil Rule No. 1417/95 which has since been affirmed by the Apex Court. Thus, the principles laid down in the said judgment shall be equally applicable to the similarly situated persons. If the petitioners are similarly situated, I see no reason to deprive them of the benefit of the aforesaid allowance, merely because, they are not party to the said judgment of this court.

For the forgoing reasons and discussions, I dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the respondents to grant the Hospital patients care allowance to the petitioners as per the Annexures 1 and 2 letters dated 25.1.88 and 11.7.90 and the aforesaid judgment of this court which has since been affirmed by the Apex court. Needless to say, that the respondents shall examine as to whether the present petitioners are similarly circumstanced with that of the petitioners in the aforesaid Writ Petition and are in fact entitled to the benefit as mentioned in Annexures 1 and 2 letters mentioned above.

The Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs.

Sd/-

B.K.Sarma, Judge

-24-

ANNEXURE: A7

3997 3991
22/10

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER INCHARGE, BH-3, CRPF, GUWAHATI

No. J.II-4/05-EC-II

Dated, the October 2005

To

No. 821390072 Pharm. B.M. Kumar,
No. 841540104 Pharm. O.N. Sumathi,
No. 871160378 N/Astt. Meenakshi Anna,
BH-3, CRPF, Guwahati-23.

Subject:- PATIENT CARE ALLOWANCE:


Reference: Your application dated 30-5-05 and 3-8-05.

It is to inform that there is no orders for payment of patient care allowance to the personnel other than those who have got orders in favour of them from the court. You may therefore submit claim for PCA alongwith Hon'ble Court's favourable decision for payment of PCA.

(Dr. Dipak Mahapatra)
Chief Medical Officer I/C
BH-3, CRPF, Guwahati -23.

This is a true copy of the original document.

Rajesh Hazarika
Adv.
17/11.




IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD
BENCH: HYDERABAD

OA No 243 of 2005
Date of Decision: 05-08-2005

Between:

B. Mohan Das, S/o V. Nanu (late)
Working in Base Hospital 2, Group Centre
Campus, Central Reserve Police Force,
PO Keshogiri, Hyderabad.



Applicant

AND

1. The Director General Of Police, Central Reserve Police Force, Lodhi Road, CGO Complex, New Delhi- 110003
2. The Director-Medical, Directorate of Central Reserve Police Force, East Block-10, Level-7 RK Puram, New Delhi-110 006.
3. The Chief Medical Officer, Base Hospital-2 Group Center Campus, Central Reserve Police Force, PO Keshogiri.
Hyderabad- 550 005

.....Respondent

Counsel for the applicant: Mr. V. Jagapathi
Counsel for the respondents: Mr. M. C. Jacob.

CORAM:

The HON'BLE MRS. BHARATI RAY, MEMBER (JUDL)

ORDER

(PER HON'BLE Mrs. Bharati Ray, Member, (J))

This application has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondents to sanction the Hospital Patient Care Allowance (hereinafter referred to as "HPCA") to the applicant for the period from 1.8.1987 to 7.9.2000 as per the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India, vide letters dated 28.9.1998 and 2.1.1999, as has been done in respect of similarly situated employees by declaring

This is a true copy of the Original Document

Rajesh Magravan
adr.
17/11.


the action of the respondent in not paying the HPCA to the applicant in the revised rates for the said period as arbitrary , discriminatory and illegal.

2. The applicant, who is the permanent employee in the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) in the cadre of Steward, is a present working on the posted strength of the 3rd respondent Unit situated at Hyderabad. The Government of India vide letters NO Z.28015/60/87-H dated 25.1.1988 and No. Z.28015/6087-H dated 28.2.1990 have conveyed the sanction of the President for the grant of HPCA with effect from 1.12.1987 to the Group 'C' and 'D' employees. Initially, sanction of was made applicable to the staff working in the Government Hospitals in Delhi and outside Delhi, having 30 beds or more. It is the contention of the applicant that since he is working in the CRPF Hospital right from the date of his initial appointment, he is entitled for HPCA as per the revised rates in accordance with the orders issued by the Government of India from time to time on par with the hospital staff employed in the Government Hospitals, as declared by the various Benches of this Tribunal.

3. The applicant while posted at Guwahati approached the Guwahati Bench of this Tribunal by filing OA No. 9 of 1995 against the inaction on the part of the respondents in not paying the applicant the HPCA. The Guwahati Bench of this Tribunal, vide its order dated 10.6.1996 allowed the said OA with the following order:

"under the facts and circumstances, we direct the respondents to pay the "Hospital Patient Care Allowance" to the applicants in accordance with the OM No Z.28015/60/87-H dated 25.1.1988 (Annexure -1 to this OA) at the monthly rate applicable to each applicant and from the date admissible to each one of them after obtaining an undertaking from them individually to the effect that the amount paid will be refunded by them in full if as the result of the aforesaid appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court it is found that the allowance is not admissible to them."

Since the said judgment was not challenged by the respondents before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the same has attained the finality. It is the contention of the applicant that as per the judgment dated 10.6.1996 passed in OA No. 9/1995, the applicant was paid HPCA



allowance. The order shall be implemented with within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The O.As are accordingly allowed. No costs."

4. Heard Mr. V. Jagapathy, Id. Counsel for the applicant and Mr. NC Jacob, Id Standing Counsel for the respondents. I have gone through the facts and material papers placed before me. I have also gone through the judgments relied upon by the parties.

5. The respondents have taken objection on the point of limitation. In this context, referring to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of MR GUPTA V. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS. ((1995) 5 SCC 628), Id. Counsel for the respondents submitted that since the Order of the Guwahati Bench of this Tribunal has been implemented by the respondents and the applicant was granted HPCA as per directions of the Ministry from 8.9.200, the relief claimed by the applicant for revised HPCA with effect from 1.1.1997, is beyond the period of limitation as per the A.T.A, 1985. Referring to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of STATE OF KARNATAKA AND OTHERS V. S M KOTRAYYA AND OTHERS ((199..) 6 SCC 267), the Id. Counsel for the respondents submitted that the applicant cannot approach this Tribunal at any time on the basis of the order

subsequently passed by the Tribunal in another case. In the above case, the Hon'ble Court has held that the mere fact the applicants filed the belated application immediately after coming to know that in similar claims relief had been granted by the Tribunal, is not a proper explanation to justify condonation of delay.

6. However, it is not denied by the respondents that the applicant is similarly situated to that of the applicants before the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal. It is also seen from the Order of the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal dated 17.4.2003 passed in OA nos. 1093/2002 and Batch, that the respondents therein also taken the point of limitation and in the said case this Tribunal had also considered the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of MR GUPTA V. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (supra) and held that the right to fixation of correct salary is a continuous cause of action and that salary includes allowances. Moreover, it is evident from the Order dated 28.9.1998 that the rate of allowance has been revised by the said order subject to the terms and conditions for payment of HPCA as mentioned in the Ministry's letter dated 25-1-1998. the Guwahati

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal

31 DEC

गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

from 1.12.1987 to 7.9.2000 in the pre-revised rates i.e. @ 75/- per month from 8.9.2000, he was paid HPCA as per the revised rates. In the context, it is stated by the applicant that the rates of HPCA payable to Group 'C' and 'D' (non-ministerial) Hospital Employees were revised by the Government of India's letter dated 28.9.1998 as under:

" The revised rates w.e.f. 1.8.1987 as per GOI letter dated 28.9.1998 are as under:-

1. Group 'C' (non-ministerial) hospital employees :
Rs. 80/- p.m to Rs. 160/- p.m.
2. Group 'D' (non-ministerial) hospital employees :
Rs. 75/- p.m to Rs. 150/- p.m.
3. Group 'C' & 'D' (non-ministerial) CGHS employees
: Rs. 80/- p.m to Rs. 160/- p.m.

Some similarly situated employees have approached the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal by filing OA Nos. 1093/2002 and batch seeking for the following reliefs:-

"i) issue a direction directing the respondents to extend the benefit of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to them at the rate of Rs. 80/- per month for the period 15.10.1987 to 1.8.1997 at Rs. 160/- p.m. from 1.8.1997 to 2.1.1999 and at Rs. 700/- p.m. from 2.1.1999 to 8.9.2000 and to applicants 6 and 7 at Rs. 75/- per month from 15.10.1987 to 1.8.1997 at Rs. 150/- p.m. from 1.8.1997 to 2.1.1999 and at Rs. 695/- p.m. from 2.1.1999 to 8.9.2000 in terms of Government orders and Supreme Court orders; and

ii) Grant such other relief or reliefs as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the circumstances of the case in the interest of justice."

The Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal allowed the said OA with the following direction:

" in the light of these facts, the respondents ^{are} directed to pay the applicants the Hospital Patient Care Allowance w.e.f. 1.8.87 or from the dates of their appointments whichever is later, at the rates of the allowance sanctioned to Group C and D non-ministerial hospital employees by order dated 25.1.1988 (Annexure A-1) and revised by order dated 28.9.1998 (Annexure A-2) and subsequent orders of revision of the


केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अपील निकाय
Central Administrative Tribunal
31 DEC 2002
गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

Bench of this Tribunal Had Allowed the HPCA allowance in terms of the Ministry's Letter dated 25-1-1988. Therefore, it is obvious that the applicant is entitled to the revised rate of HPCA in terms order subsequent to the order dated 25.1.1988, which is sanctioned subject to the conditions stipulated in order dated 25.1.1988. Therefore, in view of the above, the question of limitation in this case does not arise.

7. That being the position, as the applicant is similarly situated to that of the applicants before the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal is entitled to get the same relief as has been granted by the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal. The respondents are therefore directed to pay the applicant the HPCA with effect from 1.8.1987 or from the date of his appointment whichever ever is later, at the rates of allowance sanctioned to Group 'c' and 'D' non ministerial hospital employees by order dated 25.1.1988 and revised by order dated 26.9.1998 and subsequent orders of revision of the allowance. The respondents shall complete the above exercise within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

8. In the result, the OA is allowed to the extent indicated above with no Order as to costs.

Sd/-
Member (J) .



SL. No. 199

Corrected as per order dated 24.8.07 passed in M.P.85 & 87 of 2007

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, GUWAHATI
BENCH


Original Application No.296 & 314 of 2006.

Date of Order : This the 5th Day of July, 2007.

THE HON'BLE SHRI K.V.SACHIDANANDAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

O.A. 296 of 2006

1. Pharmacist ON Sumathy
Force No. 841540104
2. Nursing Assistant
Sathibabu
Force No.861191364
3. Nursing Assistant Swapna
Adhya, Force No. 841310198
4. Nursing Assistant
Meenakshiamma, Force No
871160378
5. Nursing Assistant GC
Sharma, Force No.
850878213
6. Laboratory Technician A
Kalaimani, Force no
851530128
7. Safai Karmachari N.Munan
Singh, Force no 860870141



The above applicants are serving in Base
Hospital III, Group Centre, CRPF, Guwahati.


Pharmacist Ajit Kumar
Force No. 830210287, 169
Bn, CRPF (at location)
Pharmacist Girish Pandey
Force No. 750400587, 121
Bn, Guwahati.

All the above are serving as Non-combatised
Nursing personnel in the Central Reserve Police
Force.

Applicants

O.A. 314 of 2006

1. Nursing Assistant
M.S.Sudhakaran
Force no 882050038
2. Pharmacist Prafulla Kumar Sahu
Force no 840720893
(The above are serving in 6th
Battalion, Central Reserve Police



This is a true copy of the original Document
Rajesh Majumdar
Sd/-
17/11.

3. Force, Kumar Ghat, Tripura.)
Nursing Assistant Kapil Deo Ram,
Force no 710559411, Group Centre,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Khatkhati, Assam

All the above are serving as non-combatised
Group C and D personnel in the Hospitals of
the Central Reserve Police Force.

..... Applicants

By Advocate Shri R. Mazumdar

- Versus -

1. The Union of India,
Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General of Police,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Lodhi Road, CGO Complex,
New Delhi-110003.
3. The Director (Medical)
Directorate General, CRPF,
East Block, 10 R.K.Puram,
New Delhi.
4. The Inspector General (Medical)
Central Reserve Police Force,
Group Centre, Amerigog,
Guwahati.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अपील निकाय
Central Administrative Tribunal

31 DEC 2006

गुवाहाटी न्यायपीठ
Guwahati Bench

..... Respondents

By Mr M.U.Ahmed, Addl.C.G.S.C (O.A.No.296/06)
& Miss U. Das, Addl. C.G.S.C (O.A. 314/2006)



ORDER

SACHIDANANDAN K.V. (V.C)

The claim in these O.As are identical and relief that has
been sought and documents relied on are also the same and therefore
with the consent of the parties this common order has been passed.


2. There are 9 applicants in O.A.296/06 and 3 applicants in
O.A.314/06. All these applicant are served as non combatised nursing

L

के.टी. प्रशासक, सी.आई.डी.
Central Administrative Tribunal
31 DEC 1999
गुवाहाटी-दिल्ली
Section

personnel and Hospital staff of the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF). The pleading is that they are entitled to get Hospital Patient Care Allowance (HPCA) which was not granted to them and therefore they have filed these applications seeking the following reliefs.

"Direct the respondents to sanction the Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the applicants for the period from 1.8.1987 to 7.9.2000 as the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India vide orders dated 28.9.1998 and 2.1.1999, as has been done in respect of similarly situated employees, by declaring the action of the respondents in not paying the Hospital Patient Care Allowance to the applicants for the period to be arbitrary, discriminatory and illegal."



3. The respondents have filed a detailed written statement contending that the application is hit by principles of waiver, estoppels and acquiescence and liable to be dismissed. The Government of India vide letter dated 29.9.1989 had introduced a scheme for combatisation of Group C & D Hospital staff and since then all the posts are being filled by combatised or to continue in civilian posts till superannuation. Some therefore opted for combatisation. Some of those hospital staff filed court cases in various courts for sanction of Patient Care allowance and the Hon'ble courts passed orders in their favour. In implementation of the court orders they were sanctioned patient care allowance. Subsequently, the Union of India filed SLP No.1093/95 in the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Union of India vs. T.M. Jose and others and stay was granted on 13.9.1996. Accordingly patient care allowance was stopped. In the meantime the Government of India MHA vide letter dated 8.9.2000 allowed Patient Care Allowance w.e.f 8.9.2000 to Group C & D civilian (Non combatised) employees of BSF, CRPF, CISF.

L


केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक आयोग
Central Administrative Tribunal

३ अक्टूबर २०००


गुवाहाटी - ७८१००४
Guwahati - 781004

Assam Rifles and National Police Academy, Hyderabad at the same rates as was being given to the employees similarly placed in the CGHS dispensaries or Central Govt. Hospitals in Delhi/outside Delhi on the same term and conditions. Accordingly the Directorate General vide letter dated 22.9.2000 passed orders to sanction PCA/HPCA to all the eligible civilian hospital staff with effect from 8.9.2000 and the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the SLP. The case was referred to MHA for grant of PCA/HPCA to all the combatised Group C & D Hospital staff as applicable to non combatised Group C & D Hospital staff and the Ministry of Finance vide letter dated 14.1.2002 decided to grant the PCA/HPCA only to those combatised Group C & D Hospital staff who were petitioners in court cases. Sanction was accorded to civilian eligible staff during the pendency of the SLP. However, a case was again referred to MHA for grant of PCA/HPCA to all the combatised Group C & D Hospital staff which is still under consideration with the Ministry of Finance. The contention of the applicants is not tenable. Payment of PCA to Group C & D (Non Ministerial) employees working in the Central Government Hospital and not to the para medical staff of CRPF. Since the petitioners are working in CRPF which is under the control of MHA the above order is not applicable to them. The Govt. of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare vide their letter dated 25.1.88 had issued orders for payment of PCA to Group C & D (Non ministerial) staff working in the Central Govt. Hospitals and Hospitals under the Delhi administration only and not to the Para Medical Staff of CRPF. The rates of HPCA/PCA was revised for the employees who





were in receipt of the said allowance continuously. The applicants who were involved in various court cases have been given the benefit on the basis of the judgment pronounced by the Hon'ble Courts. The respondents submitted that the applicants are getting the benefit of HPCA/PCA from 8.9.2000 i.e. from the date from which the benefit has been extended to them. The proposal for extension of the benefit of HPCA/PCA to combatised Group C & D non ministerial staff of Central Para Military forces under consideration in their Ministry in consultation with Ministry of Finance/Ministry of Law and the issue is likely to take some more time to take decision and considering that With CPC had since began working with a task of recommending allowances to the Govt. employees, as such Central Para Military forces may take time from the court in case any court order pending compliance on the issue.



4. Heard Mr R. Majumdar, learned counsel for the applicants and Mr M.U.Ahmed, Addl.C.G.S.C and Miss U. Das, Addl.C.G.S.C for the respondents. Learned counsel appearing for the parties have taken me to the various pleadings, evidence and materials placed on record. Counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicants are getting the HPCA/PCA from 8.9.2000 and this was granted as per circular dated 8.9.2000 as per the scheme that was initiated. There is no reason to deny them the said benefit to the applicants. The learned counsel for the respondents have very persuasively argued that the HPCA/PCA was granted to the applicant who have approached the court.

3-10-87

गुवाहाटी हाथपीठ
Guwahati Bench

6

5. I have given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the parties and materials placed on record. Annexure-1 is the circular dated 25.1.88 whereby the HPCA was granted to Group C and D (Non ministerial) Hospital employees.

"With reference to DCMS No. B.12017/3/87-MH dated 9.4.87 on the subject mentioned above. I am directed to convey the sanction of the President to the grant of Hospital Patient Care Allowance to Group 'C' and 'D' (Non-Ministerial) employees including Drivers of Ambulance Cars, but excluding Staff Nurses, at the rate of Rs.80/- and Rs.75/- per month respectively with night weightage allowance, if sanctioned by the Central Government, will be admissible to those employees working in the Central Government Hospitals and Hospitals under the Delhi Administration.

The expenditure involved will be met out of the budget grant of the concerned Hospital during the financial year i.e. 1987-88.

This issued with the concurrence of Ministry of finance vide their Dy. No. 1167/FS/27 dated 15.10.87."

The Annexure-II letter dated 23.9.1998 shows that the said scheme has already been sanctioned by the President and implemented by the Govt. of India at the revised rate to the various categories of person with effect from 1.8.1987. This is again reiterated in Annexure-III letter dated 2.1.1999. In the case of Civil Rule No.1417/95 dated 12.3.96 before the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court which has dealt with the subject matter passed the order. Operative portion of which is reproduced below :

"Accordingly this writ application is allowed with the direction it would be fit and proper to direct that all the applicants in this Civil Rule, who are para-medical staff should get hospital patients care allowance as per instruction of the Government of India dated 25.1.88 subject to the condition mentioned therein. This order should be implemented



केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायालय
Central Administrative Tribunal
3-08-1996
गुवाहाटी - तबरीठ
C.A. Bench

within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of this order. The petitioners may obtain the certified copy of this order to produce the same before the authority to do the needful in terms of this order.

It is made clear that the Petitioners are para-medical staff but they are working in different hospitals.

This disposes of this writ application."

This Bench of the Tribunal in O.A.9/95 dated 10.6.1996 in tune with the order of the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court, granted the benefit. The operative portion of the order is quoted as under :


"Under the facts and circumstances we direct the respondents to pay the "Hospital Patients Care Allowance to the applicants in accordance with the O.M.No.Z.28015/60/87-H, dated 25.1.1988 (Annexure I to this OA) at the monthly rate applicable to each applicant and from the date of admissible to each one of them after obtaining an undertaking from them individually to the effect that the amount paid will be refunded by them in full if as the result of the aforesaid appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court it is found that the allowance is not admissible to them.

Considering that the period for which payment is to be made may date back to as early as 1987, we allow the respondents reasonable time for implementation of this order. In no case, however, the respondents shall delay the payment beyond 31.10.1996.

The application is allowed in terms of the directions given above. No order as to costs."

Subsequently the writ appeal filed by the applicant was allowed by the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court vide Annexure VI order. The operative portion of the said order is quoted below :

"Accordingly this Writ Appeal is allowed and the Writ Petition i.e. Civil Rule No.4029/96 shall also stand allowed. In Civil rule No.1417/95 (Niranjan Das & 23 Others, Petitioner v. Union of India, Respondent) by order dated 12.3.86, the Writ petition was allowed and the same benefit was given to the writ petitioners. The order passed by the learned Single Judge in this case shall stand quashed in view of the




4X
2. 21. 1987. 1. 1. 1987. 1. 1. 1987.
Central Administrative Tribunal
1. 1. 1987. 1. 1. 1987. 1. 1. 1987.
1. 1. 1987. 1. 1. 1987. 1. 1. 1987.

order of disposal of the appeal by the Supreme Court."

In another judgment of the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court in WP(C) 474 of 2003 dated 30.9.2004 the Hon'ble High Court observed as follows :


".....Thus the stand of the respondents is not on the ground of ineligibility of the petitioners to get the said allowance. The only ground is that, since the petitioners have not approached the court of law, they are not entitled to get similar benefit as was given to the other similarly situated person. The principles involved in granting the aforesaid allowance have already been finalized by this court in the aforementioned Writ Petition i.e. Civil Rule No.1417/95 which has since been affirmed by the Apex court. Thus, the principles laid down in the said judgment shall be equally applicable to the similarly situated persons. If the petitioners are similarly situated, I see no reason to deprive them of the benefit of the aforesaid allowance, merely because, they are not party to the said judgment of this court".



The applicant also made representation dated 30.5.2005 for grant of the said benefit. Thereafter, the Hyderabad Bench of the Tribunal in O.A.243/2005 had the occasion to consider the issue for granting the benefit to the applicant. The operative portion of the said order is reproduced below :

"That being the position, as the applicant is similarly situated to that of the applicants before the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal is entitled to get the same relief as has been granted by the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal. The respondents are therefore directed to pay the applicant the HPCA with effect from 1.8.1987 or from the date of his appointment which ever is later at the rates of allowance sanctioned to Group 'C' and 'D' non ministerial hospital employees by order dated 25.1.1988 and revised by order dated 28.9.1998 and subsequent order of revision of the allowance. The respondents shall complete the above exercise within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

✓




In the result, the O.A. is allowed to the extent indicated above with no order as to costs."

I am in respectful agreement with the orders of the Hyderabad Bench of the Tribunal. Further, when the matter came up for hearing the counsel for the respondents submitted that as per letter dated 9.4.2007 the matter is under active consideration of the Additional Deputy Inspector General of Police, Group Centre, CRPF, Guwahati and order has already been passed on 9.4.07. The relevant portion of the said letter is reproduced below :

"A case for grant of Hospital patient care allowance/patient care allowance to all combatised Group 'C' and 'D' Hospital staff is under consideration with Ministry of Home Affairs in view of judgment pronounced by various courts. Further quoted that, MHA vide their UO No. II-27012/31/2006.PF III dated 19.3.07 have intimated that "the proposal for extension of the benefit of Hospital patient care allowance/patient care allowance to combatised Group 'C' and 'D' non ministerial staff of Central Para military forces under consideration in their ministry in consultation with Ministry of Finance/Ministry of Law and the issue is likely to take some more time to take a decision and considering that Vth CPC had since begun working with a task of recommending allowances to the Govt. employees, as such Central Para Military forces may take time from the court in case any court order pending compliance on the issue."

The counsel for the applicant submitted that the said order is only pertains to the combatant Group 'C' and 'D' non ministerial staff and not for non combatant Group 'C' and 'D' employees and therefore the said order is not pertaining to the interest of the applicant.

Considering the entire issue involved in these cases and accepting the judgment of the Hyderabad Bench of the Tribunal I am of the view that these applicants are also entitled to get the same benefit




केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायालय
Central Administrative Tribunal
31 DEC 2007
गुवाहाटी - 14पीठ
Guwahati Bench

10

if the orders passed by the Tribunal has attained finality. This aspect may be verified by the respondents and if so they are hereby directed to pass appropriate orders accordingly and communicate the same to the applicants of these O.As within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order and pay PCAMHPCA for the period from 1.8.1987 to 7.9.2000 as the revised rates sanctioned by the Government of India vide orders dated 28.9.1998 and 2.1.1999.

In the result, the O.A. is allowed to the extent indicated above with no order as to costs.

SA/ VICE CHAIRMAN



PE

Date of Application : 10.10.07
Date on which copy is ready : 10.10.07
Date on which copy is received : 10.10.07
Certified to be true copy

Section Officer (Jd II)
A. T. Guwahati Bench
Guwahati-5.
10/10/07


CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH:

1. Original Application NO. 227/07

2. MIs Petition No. _____

3. Contempt Petition No. _____

4. Review Application No. _____



Applicant(s) A. Shamsudeen T. O.S. VS Union of India & Ors

Advocate for the Applicants Rajesh Mazumdar

Advocate for the Respondent(S) Case

Notes of the Registry

Date

Order of the Tribunal



12.10.07.

On the prayer of Mr. R. Mazumdar, learned counsel appearing for Applicant No. 2 (R. Chellappan Pillai), Applicant No. 3 (Smt. Tulashii Bala Das) Applicant No. 4 (Umesh Prasad) are permitted to withdraw ^{from this} the case with liberty to file fresh Original Application ^{and} as consequence ^{of this} Original No. 277 of 2007 is confined in respect of Applicant No. 1 (A. Shamsudeen) only.

Issue Notice on the Respondents requiring them to file reply by 07.12.2007.

Sent copies of this order to all the Applicants and to the Respondents (alongwith Notices) in the address given in the Original Application.

Five copies of this order be also handed over to the counsel for both the parties.

Sd/- vice Chairman
Sd/- Member (A)

TRUE COPY

गतिविधि

गुवाहाटी न्यायालय
Office of the
Central Administrative Tribunal
Guwahati Bench
गुवाहाटी न्यायालय
GUWAHATI BENCH
गुवाहाटी/गुवाहाटी

This is a true copy of the original document.

Rajesh Mazumdar

Advocate

17/11/07