

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

**OA No.1893/2018**

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

**Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)**

Smt. Chand Bala @ Renu Bala  
Aged about 68 years,  
W/o late Sh. Rattan Singh  
R/o House No.B-16, Janhanpur,  
Matawali Gali, Delhi – 110 094.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri T.D. Yadav)

Versus

Union of India through

1. Secretary,  
M/o Housing & Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Executive Engineer,  
Vidyut Mangal-10, CPWD  
Andrews Ganj, New Delhi -49.
3. The Pay & Account Officer (CPWD)  
B-203, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, B-Wing,  
I.P. Bhawan, New Delhi.

...Respondents

**ORDER (ORAL)**

Heard.

2. The applicant is before the Tribunal seeking a direction to be given to the respondents to treat her, who is known by two names - one Smt. Chand Bala and the other Renu Bala, as wife of the deceased employee Rattan Singh and to grant her family pension. In support of her claim, the applicant has stated that in a complaint dated 08.07.2002 (Annexure A-5 Colly), her husband Rattan Singh had stated that she was also known as Renu Bala.

Learned counsel for the applicant states that in his statement dated 24.06.2012 before the police, the husband of the applicant reiterates the same. The third document relied upon by the applicant is the order dated 12.04.2004 passed by the court of Ms. Ruby Alka Gupta, Metropolitan Magistrate, Karkardoom Court, Delhi in a case which was fought between Renu Bala and Rattan Singh. The applicant submits that the order of this Court also implies that Renu Bala and Chand Bala is one and the same person.

3. In the impugned order dated 08.03.2017 issued by the respondents in response to the legal notice dated 02.03.2017 served by the applicant, it is clearly stated that in the official record the name of Rattan Singh's wife is entered as Chand Bala and does not mention anywhere the name of Renu Bala as Rattan Singh's wife. However, while stating so, the respondents informed the applicant that a set of pension papers has been sent to the concerned Bank along with joint photograph of Rattan Singh and his wife Chand Bala and asked the applicant to contact the concerned Manager of the Bank to clarify the position, but the applicant instead of approaching the Branch Manager has come to this Tribunal.

4. From the above, it is very clear that it is a case where the applicant is trying to establish that she is known by two names i.e. Renu Bala and Chand Bala but she is one and the same person and the wife of Rattan Singh upon whose death, the family pension needs to be granted to her.

5. Strictly speaking, it is not a service matter. It is a matter related to the identity of the applicant and the legality of her two names for which this Tribunal is not the appropriate and correct forum. Moreover, the applicant has not been able to produce any judicial order and/or any order of any authority that, in any way, establishes that Renu Bala and Chand Bala is one and the same person.

6. In view of the facts stated above, I am of the clear view that this OA is not maintainable in this Tribunal. The applicant, therefore, needs to take her grievance to a legal forum, which is competent to deal with this issue.

7. OA is accordingly dismissed in above terms.

**(Uday Kumar Varma)**  
Member (A)

/AhujA/