

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**OA/310/00174/2017**

**Dated Tuesday the 6<sup>th</sup> day of February Two Thousand Eighteen**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)**

P.Mariyapushpam,  
W/o. Paul,  
Aged about 63 years,  
Residing at,  
No. 1, 22<sup>nd</sup> Street,  
Aavai Nagar, Lawspet,  
Puducherry 605008.  
Lastly employed as,  
Village Assistant,  
Taluk Office, Bahour,  
Puducherry. ....Applicant

By Advocate M/s. M. Gnanasekar

Vs

1. Union of India, rep by,  
The Chief Secretary to Government,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry.  
2. The Director General of Police,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry.  
3. The Inspector General of Police,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry.  
4. The Commandant (Home Guard),  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry.  
5. The Secretary to Government,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
New Delhi. ....Respondents

By Advocate Mr. R. Syed Mustafa (R1-R4)

**ORAL ORDER**

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

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

“(i) To set aside the order dated 05.05.2015 in No. 1418/Esst.I(B)/A1/HG/2015 passed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent and consequently direct the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent to at least count 50 % of the previous service rendered in the Home Guards Organization as a qualifying Service for pensioner benefits and

(ii) Pass such further orders as are necessary to meet the ends of justice.

(iii) Award exemplary cost and thus render justice.”

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant had worked as Home Guard from 10.11.1989 till 26.03.2007 on which date she was appointed as Village Assistant in the Revenue Department of the first respondent. She retired on 31.12.2012. The applicant had made a representation for counting 50% of the service rendered as Home Guard for the purpose of service benefits. However, since the respondents rejected the representation, the applicant is before this Tribunal.

3. Learned counsel for respondents would, however, submit that the applicant was not entitled to any service benefit as Home Guard as the Home Guards Organisation was basically a voluntary organisation. Accordingly, there is no merit in the OA which is liable to be dismissed, it is urged.

4. I have considered the matter. This Tribunal had considered a

similar matter in OAs 1102/2015 and 1103/2015 and it was observed that since the services rendered by the applicants therein as Home Guard was a voluntary service with honorarium, the prayer of the applicant that 50% of the services be counted for pensionary benefits could not be acceded to. There is no reason to take a different view in this OA.

5. Accordingly, this OA is dismissed as devoid of merits.

**(R. Ramanujam)**  
**Member(A)**  
**06.02.2018**

SKSI