

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

**O.A. No. 1121/2018
M.A. No. 1874/2018 and 2183/2018
And
C.P. No. 356/2018**

New Delhi, this the 7th day of September, 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Dr. Gopal Chandra Nanda
Aged about 60 years,
S/o. Late Ganesh Nanda
R/o.-Dr. A. Lakshmi pati Research Centre for
Ayurveda (CCRAS), VHS Campus, adyar,
Chennai-600 113.

(Was working as Medical Officer/Research officer under
At Central Council for Research in Ayurvedic Sciences –
“Group-A”.Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mr. Manish Verma)

Versus

1. Ministry of Ayush
Through its Secretary,
Ayush Bhawan, B Block,
GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi – 110 023.
2. The Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare,
Room No. 348, ‘A’ Wing,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi – 110 011.
3. Central Council for Research in Ayurvedic Sciences
Through its Director General,
Jawahar Lal Nehru Bhartiya Chikitsa Avum
Homeopathy Anusandhan, Bhavan,
61-65, Institutional Area, Opp. ‘D’ Block,
Janakpuri, New Delhi – 110 058.Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. Rohit Bhagat for Mr. Saurabh Chadda)

O R D E R (O R A L)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :

This Original Application is filed challenging the order dated 09.03.2018, Annexure-A/1 issued by the Deputy Director, Centre Council for Research in Ayurvedic Sciences. In the said order, the respondents informed the applicant that Dr. Gopal Chandra Nanda, Assistant Director (Ayurveda) will be superannuated on attaining the age of 60 years. The applicant claims the benefit of the notification issued by the Government of India enhancing the age of the medical practitioners from 60 to 65 years subject to certain conditions.

2. In O.A No. 3335/2018, identical question arose for consideration. After discussing the matter at length, this Tribunal dismissed the O.A by taking a view that benefit of enhancement of age of superannuation is not available to the Doctors who are employed in Research Institutes. Following the same, we dismiss this O.A also.

C.P. No. 356/2018 :

3. The Contempt Petition is filed alleging that despite interim order passed by this Tribunal on 18.07.2017 to pay the salary, the respondents have not complied with it.

4. Since we have dismissed the O.A. itself, it is not necessary to pass orders in the C.P. The Contempt Petition is accordingly closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/Mbt/