

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00154/2014
Chandigarh, this the 20th Day of January, 2015

...
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).
HON'BLE MRS. RAJWANT SANDHU, MEMBER (A)

...
Kehar Singh son of Shri Ram, resident of House No.185, Street No.2,
Noorwaala, Panipat, District Panipat.

... Applicant

Versus

1. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Karnal Division, Karnal,
2. The Chief Post Master General, Haryana Circle, Ambala.
3. The Director of Accounts (Postal) Ambala.
4. The Secretary, Ministry of Communication, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

... Respondents

Present: Sh. R.P. Mehra, counsel for the applicant.
Sh. Deepak Agnihotri, counsel for the respondents.

ORDER

BY HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. This O.A. has been filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeking mainly the following relief:

- "8 (i) To compute the Basic Pension per decision of the Government contained in Para 12 vide which Basic Pension of 4605/- when multiplied by 1.86 plus 24% of 4605/- comes to 8565/- and 1105/- respectively at 9670/-
- (ii) To allow arrears of pension at suitable interest."

2. It is admitted by learned counsel for the parties that issue involved in the present O.A. has already been adjudicated upon against the applicant vide decision dated 19.01.2015 in O.A. No.060/00156/2014

1
d

etc. titled Milkhi Ram Kakkar Vs. UOI & Ors. and that the matter may be disposed of in the same terms.

3. Ordered accordingly. Relevant paras of the order dated 19.01.2015 are reproduced as under:

"9. We have given our careful consideration to the matter. There does not appear to be any defect in the revision of pension effected in the case of the applicants in these OAs as the same is in accordance with the OM F.No.38/37/08-P&W(A), dated 01.09.2008 (Annexure R-2) and the tables attached with the OM. Although, it appears that another OM was issued on 28.01.2013 regarding revision of pension of pre 2006 pensioners (Annexure R-3) and the pension of the applicant might actually be reduced if the pension is revised in accordance with this OM, Sh. K.P.S.Dhillon, learned counsel for the respondents has made a statement at the bar that the respondents will not take any action to reduce the pension of the applicants from the level which they are drawing at present.

10. In view of the discussion above, we conclude that there is no merit in these OAs and the same are rejected."

(RAJWANT SANDHU)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Place: Chandigarh.
Dated: 20.01.2015.

KR*