

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**OA/310/00436/2017, OA/310/00437/2017, OA/310/00438/2017,  
OA/310/00439/2017**

**Dated Tuesday the 19<sup>th</sup> day of June Two Thousand Eighteen**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE SMT. B. BHAMATHI, Member (A)**

1.A.Ramu,	....Applicant in OA 436/2017
2.L.Kaliyan,	....Applicant in OA 437/2017
3.P.Arumugam,	....Applicant in OA 438/2017
4.C.Selvaraj.	....Applicant in OA 439/2017

By Advocate M/s. Ratio Legis

Vs

1.Union of India rep by, The General Manager, Southern Railway, Park Town, Chennai 600003.	
2.The Divisional Personnel Officer, Salem Division, Southern Railway, Salem.	....Respondents in all OAs

By Advocate Dr. D.Simon

**ORAL ORDER**

**(Pronounced by Hon'ble Smt. B. Bhamathi, Member(A))**

Since the applicants in all the OAs are similarly placed and they have sought a similar relief, a common order is passed in these OAs.

2. The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

“To call for the records related to the impugned order SA/P 353/OA 1989/2014 dated 25.01.2017 and to quash the same which was issued based on the Railways Bora Letter No.E(P&A)-2010/RT-2 dated 28.06.2011 and E(P&A)I-2013/FE-2/3 dated 01.12.2014 with a stipulation that the personnel to have 33 years of qualifying service and to quash to that extent of unreasonable condition of 33 years of qualifying service under the age group of 55-57 and further to direct the respondents to consider applicant's son for appointment letting applicant to go on retirement on voluntary request under LARGES Scheme and to pass such other order / orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and favourable to the applicant and proper and thus to render justice. ”

2. When the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the applicant produces a copy of the order dt. 20.12.2017 of this Tribunal in OA 534/2015 and submits that since the subject matter in this OA is similar to the above OA, similar orders could be passed in this OA also.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents has no objection if an order similar to the one in OA 534/2015 is passed in this OA.

4. On perusal of order dt. 20.12.2017, it is seen that the OA

534/2015 was disposed of in the following manner :-

“.....

6. In view of the above, I deem it appropriate to leave it to the respondents to take an expeditious decision on continuing the LARSGESS scheme or otherwise, in accordance with the Constitution of India. The question of considering the claim of the applicant would arise only after and if at all, the scheme is brought back into operation. In such an event, the applicant shall be at liberty to file a representation before the competent authority which may be disposed of thereafter within a reasonable time period.

7. OA is disposed of as above. No order as to costs.”

5. Considering the submission made by both counsels, this OA is disposed of with a similar direction as in OA 534/2015 (supra). No order as to costs.

**(B. Bhamathi)**  
**Member(A)**  
**19.06.2018**

SKSI