

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JABALPUR BENCH

Circuit Sitting : BILASPUR

Original Application No.67/1999

Bilaspur, this the 8th day of December, 2003

Hon'ble Shri M. P. Singh, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri G. Shanthappa, Judicial Member

O.P. Seengal
s/o Late Lkeh Ram Seengal
Ex-Manager
Bhilai Steel Plant
Steel Authority of India Limited
r/o A/6 Saket Colony
Katulbod.
Bhilai - 490 002
Teg. & Distt. Durg (MP). ... Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

1. Union of India through
Secretary
Ministry of Personnel, Public
Grievances and Pensions
(Department of Pension and Pensioners Welfare)
New Delhi.
2. The Director General of Works
Govt. of India
Central Public Works Department
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi - 110 011.
3. Steel Authority of India Limited
through Managing Director
Bhilai Steel Plant
Ispat Bhawan
Bhilai Nagar, Tah. & Dist. Durg (MP). .. Respondents

(By Advocate: None)

ORDER (Oral)

By G. Shanthappa, Judicial Member:

None appeared for both the parties. Since
this matter pertains to the year 1999, we proceed to
dispose of the OA, in terms of Rules 15 and 16 of the
Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987.



Contd.....2/-

2. The said OA is filed seeking relief for a direction to the respondents to release the pensionary benefits of the applicant.

3. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the applicant was appointed as Sectional Officer in the services of Respondent No.2 vide order dated 17.9.1947. Subsequently, his services were taken under the 4th Respondent. The service particulars of the applicant are mentioned in Para 5.2 of the OA. The applicant has annexed a ^{service} certificate at Annexure A2 which was issued by the Managing Director wherein it has been mentioned that the applicant was in employment from 30.1.1959 to 30.9.1983 and he superannuated from service on 30.9.1983.

4. The case of the applicant is that the applicant is asking only for pensionary benefits, i.e., pro-rata pension. Unless the service particulars of the applicant worked under Respondent No.2 ~~are~~ ^{are} not decided, the 3rd Respondent cannot consider the case of the applicant for pro-rata pension.

5. The applicant has made number of representations. ~~Along with~~ A communication issued by Respondent No.2 vide dated 11.8.1999 to Respondent No.3 to consider the request and sent necessary information/documents to facilitate to examine the request of the applicant.


6. The grievance of the applicant is pending under the respondents, the applicant has approached this Tribunal for necessary relief as prayed in the OA.


Contd...3/-

7. Since the grievance of the applicant is pending, the reliefs as prayed in this OA cannot be granted.

8. In view of the above position, ends of justice would be met, if the present OA is disposed of with ^adirection to the applicant to submit a ^{sep.} detailed representation to the respondents No.2 and 3 along with the necessary documents produced in this OA and also facts mentioned in the OA within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Thereafter, the respondents are directed to consider the representation to be filed by the applicant and pass a reasoned and speaking order within two months from the date of receipt of copy of the representation from the applicant. We order accordingly.

9. The OA is accordingly disposed of in terms of the above directions. No order as to costs.


(G. SHANTAPPA)
Judicial Member


(M. P. SINGH)
Vice Chairman

/rao/

पृष्ठान्त सं अं/का दि.....
जुलै २००३

- (1)
(2)
(3)
(4)
राज्याचे उच्च न्यायालय कार्यालय, कोलार


16/12/03