

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...  
**O. A. No.060/00297/2017      Date of decision: 14.11.2017**

...  
**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).**

Dharam Paul son of Shri Pritu Ram, aged 70 years, Inspector, Group 'C' (Retired) resident of Village and Post Office Kalyanpur, Tehsil and District Jalandhar (Punjab).

**...APPLICANT  
VERSUS**

1. Union of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue through Chairman, Central Board of Direct Taxes, Room No.460, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Samrat Hotel, Chanakya Puri, New Delhi-110021.
2. Principal Commissioner of Income Tax-II, Jalandhar.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**PRESENT:** Sh. Manohar Lal, Counsel for the applicant.  
Sh. K. K. Thakur, counsel for the respondents.

**ORDER (Oral)**

...  
**SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-**

1. Learned counsel for the parties are in agreement that this issue has already been considered by Division Bench of this Tribunal in the case of **Satya Devi Vs. U.O.I & Ors.** (O.A. No.060/00526/2015), where on the statement made by learned counsel for the applicant, a bunch of OAs were disposed of in terms of order dated 20.03.2017 passed by the Ernakulam Bench of the Tribunal in the case of **R. Ravindran Pillai Vs. UOI & Ors.** (O.A. No.180/00024/2015). A similar prayer has also been made today. Relevant para of the order passed in the case of R. Ravindran Pillai reads as under:-

"10. In the result Annexure A1 is quashed and set aside. The respondents shall re-consider the claim of the applicant in the light of the observations made in this order, in the order dated 18.7.2013 in OA No. 64 of 2013 of the coordinate Bench of this Tribunal at Ahmadabad and the judgment dated 28-12-2015 of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh in CWP No. 4621/2011 and consider reimbursement of the expenses incurred by the applicant as per Annexures A5 & A6 bills. The aforesaid exercise shall be completed by the respondents within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The OA is disposed of as above. No order as to costs."

2. Considering consensus between the parties, this O.A. is also disposed of in terms of decision rendered in the case of Ravindran Pillai (supra). Accordingly, the impugned order is hereby quashed and set aside. The matter is remitted back to consider in terms of Para 10 of Ravindran Pillai (supra). No order as to costs.



Date: 14.11.2017.

Place: Chandigarh.

'KR'