

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Madras Bench**

**MA/310/00030/2018 (in)(&) OA/310/00070/2018**

**Dated Monday the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of January Two Thousand Eighteen**

**P R E S E N T**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.Ramanujam, Member(A)**

P.Dakshnamoorthy,  
Chief Ticket Inspector(Retd.),  
Southern Railway,  
Madurai Division,  
Madurai. .. Applicant

By Advocate **M/s.Ajmal Associates**

**Vs.**

1. Union of India, rep by  
The General Manager,  
Southern Railway,  
Park Town, Chennai 600 001.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Railway Divisional Personnel Office,  
Southern Railway, Madurai Division,  
Madurai.
3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,  
Railway Divisional Office,  
Personnel Branch,  
Southern Railway,  
Madurai Division,  
Madurai. .. Respondents

By Advocate **Mr.P.Srinivasan**

**ORAL ORDER**

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr.R.Ramanujam, Member(A)

Heard. MA for condonation of delay of 667 days in filing the OA is allowed. Delay condoned.

2. The applicant has filed this OA seeking the following relief:-

“to call for the records relating to the impugned order in U/P500/III/223 dated 06.3.2015 issued by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent and quash the same as illegal and thus render justice and consequently direct the respondents to release the applicant's retirement benefits within a specified time as may be stipulated by this Hon'ble Tribunal and pass any other or further order as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit.”

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a retired Chief Ticket Inspector of the Southern Railway. He retired on 31.3.2015 on superannuation. The respondents have not settled his retirement benefits till now inspite of several reminders, it is alleged.

4. It is further submitted that the applicant made two representations including the one dated 12.9.2017 for early release of his retirement benefits which remain unanswered. The applicant would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to consider the representation made on the said date alongwith the previous representation dated 24.5.2016 and pass appropriate orders within a time limit to be stipulated by this Tribunal.

5. Mr.P.Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and submits that if time is granted a detailed reply would be filed.

6. Be that as it may, keeping in view the limited relief sought and without going into the substantive merits of the applicant's claim, I deem it appropriate to direct the competent authority to consider the representation of the applicant dated 12.9.2017 alongwith the previous representation dated 24.5.2016 and pass a speaking order in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. OA is disposed of at the admission stage.

(R.Ramanujam)  
Member(A)  
22.01.2018

/G/