

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**OA No. 3276/2015**

New Delhi this the 14<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2018

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)**

Shri Pavneesh Kumar  
s/o Shri Prem Chand, age 33 years  
candidate for the Group D Post  
r/o V & PO Nandi Ferozpur  
Distt Saharanpur (UP)

..Applicant

(Advocate : Mr. Manjeet Singh Reen)

Versus

Union of India & others

1. The General Manager  
Northern Railway  
Baroda House, New Delhi
2. The Divisionl Railway Manager  
Northern Railway  
Estate Entry Road  
DRM Office, New Delhi
3. The Station Supdt.  
Northern Railway  
Tapri Junction  
Tapri

...Respondents

(Advocate: Mr. Krishan Kant)

**O R D E R (Oral)**

**Ms. Nita Chowdhury:**

The applicant has filed this Original Application (OA), seeking the following reliefs:-

- “8.1 That this Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to allow this Original Application and set-aside the impugned dt. 14.7.2015 and direct the respondents to appoint his ward i.e. Shri Pavneesh Kumar under LARSGESS Scheme with all consequential benefits.
- 8.2 That this Hon'ble Tribunal may also be graciously pleased to direct the respondents to consider the case of the applicant for extending the benefit of Liberalized Active Retirement Scheme for Guaranteed Employee for Safety Staff (LARSGESS) with all consequential benefits.
- 8.3 That this Hon'ble Tribunal may further be graciously be pleased to direct the respondents to consider the case of the applicant for

extending the benefit of Liberalized Active Retirement Scheme for Guaranteed Employee for Safety Staff (LARSGESS) with all consequential benefits.

- 8.4 That this Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to direct the respondents to produce all relevant records before this Hon'ble Tribunal in the interest of justice.
- 8.5 That any other or further relief which this Hon'ble Tribunal may be deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case may also be granted in favour of the applicants.
- 8.6 That the cost of the proceedings may also be awarded in favour to the applicants."

2. When the matter is taken up for hearing, counsel for the applicant appeared. In a similar case, i.e. OA No. 960/2016 (**Pala Ram v. Union of India & Ors.**), it is found that the Railway Board, vide its letter No.E(P&A)I-2015/RT-43 dated 26.09.2018, has terminated the LARSGESS Scheme in view of directions of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 508/2018 dated 08.01.2018. The said order of the Railway Board reads as under:-

"Sub: Termination of the LARSGESS Scheme in view of directions of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No. 508/2018 dated 08.01.2018.

Ref: Board's letter of even number dated 27.10.2017.

The Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in its judgment dated 27.04.16 in CWP No. 7714 of 2016 had held that the Safety Related Retirement Scheme 2004 (later renamed as the Liberalised Active Retirement Scheme for Guaranteed Employment for Safety Staff (LARSGESS, 2010) "*prima facie does not stand to the test of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India*" It had directed "*before making any appointment under the offending policy, let its validity and sustainability be revisited keeping in view the principles of equal opportunity and elimination of monopoly in holding public employment.*" Thereafter, in its judgment dated 14.07.17 (Review Petition RA-CW-330-2017 in CWP No. 7714 of 2016), the Hon'ble High Court reiterated its earlier direction and stated "*such a direction was necessitated keeping in view the mandate of the Constitution Bench in State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, (2006) 4 SCC 1.*"

- 1.1 *In the Appeal against the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, while disposing of the SLP (C) No. 508/2018 vide its order dt. 8.01.18, declined to interfere with the directions of the High Court.*

2. In compliance with the above directions, Ministry of Railways have revisited the scheme duly obtaining legal opinion and consulted Ministry of Law & Justice. Accordingly, it has been decided to terminate the LARSGESS Scheme w.e.f. 27.10.2017 i.e. the date from which it was put on hold. No further appointments should be made under the Scheme except in cases where employees have already retired under the LARSGESS Scheme before 27.10.17 (but not normally superannuated) and their wards could not be appointed due to the Scheme having been put on hold in terms of Board's letter dated 27.10.17 though they had successfully completed the entire process and were found medically fit. All such appointments should be made with the approval of the competent authority.”

3. From the facts of this case, it is clear that the respondents had not granted the request of applicant to be considered for voluntary retirement and that as per Para 2 of the aforesaid Railway Board's letter, the scheme of LARSGESS has now been terminated w.e.f. 27.10.2017.

4. In view of the above facts and circumstances, nothing remains to be adjudicated in this matter and the OA is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(S.N. Terdal)**  
**Member (J)**

**(Nita Chowdhury)**  
**Member (A)**

/lg/