

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No. 2606/2014

This the 01st day of December, 2015

**Hon'ble Shri Sudhir Kumar, Member (A)**  
**Hon'ble Shri Raj Vir Sharma, Member(J)**

1. Ex-Nk Harminder Singh, 46 years  
S/o Shri Karam Singh,  
R/o House No WZ 1080B Nagal Raya, New Delhi.
2. Ex-Nk Ravinder Singh Tomar, 43 years  
S/o Shri Shis Pal Singh Tomar,  
R/o : House No.179, Nagal Raya, New Delhi.
3. Ex-Nk Lekh Raj, 43 years  
S/o Shri Kuwar Pal Singh,  
R/o House No.127,  
Gali No.9, Mahavir Enclave, New Delhi.
4. Ex-Sub Satyavir Singh S/o Shri Roshan Lal, Age 49 years,  
R/o H.No. 181, Gali No.5,  
Mahavir Enclave, New Delhi. .. Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri Janak Raj Rana )

Versus

1. Union of India  
Through Secretary (Defence)  
Ministry of Defence,  
South Block, New Delhi.
2. Engineer-in-Chief Branch  
Integrated HQ of MOD  
Kashmir House, Rajaji Marg  
New Delhi-110010
3. Commandant  
Bengal Engineer Group & Records  
PIN : 908779  
C/O 56 APO
4. Union Public Service Commission  
Dholpur House  
Shahjahan Road,  
New Delhi-110003.
5. Secretary  
DOP&T

Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market  
New Delhi -110003

.. Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Amit Yadav for Mr. Ravinder Aggarwal-4 )  
Dr. Ch. Shamsuddin Khan

Order (oral)

**Per Sudhir Kumar, Member (A)**

Heard the learned counsel for both the sides. It has been submitted by the counsel for the respondents-UPSC that though the case is covered by the judgment and order dated 29.05.2015 in O.A. No. 2266/2014 **Dalbir Singh Vs. UOI & Ors.**, as he has pointed out, all the four applicants in this O.A. did not retire during the relevant period from 27.04.2011 to 16.04.2012, mentioned in para 23 of the above order, which was the period for which retrospective amendment in the Rules had been set aside.

2. Therefore, this O.A. is disposed of with the direction to the respondents to examine the cases of the four applicants of this O.A., and if any of the four applicants of this O.A. have retired during the concerned period, they would be given protection on the basis of the aforesaid judgment, and anybody who had retired before or after that period, would not be entitled to that protection. The present O.A. is disposed of in above terms, but there shall be no order as to costs.

(Raj Vir Sharma)  
Member (J)

(Sudhir Kumar)  
Member (A)

/sarita/