

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

OA/020/00084/2018

Date of CAV : 12-11-2018

Date of Order : 29-11-2018

Between :

V. Gangadhar S/o Ram Rao,
Aged 65 years, Occ : Retired P.A., Anantapur Division,
R/o H.No.15-5-41, Ubbayappa Street,
HINDUPUR – 515 201, Anantapur District, A.P.Applicant

AND

1. Union of India, represented by
The Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions,
Department of Pension & Pensioner's Welfare,
Lok Nayak Bhavan, New Delhi – 110 003.
2. The Director General of Posts,
Dak Sadan, New Delhi - 110 001.
3. The Chief Postmaster General,
A.P. Circle, VIJAYAWADA-520013.
4. The Postmaster General,
Kurnool Region, KURNOOL – 518 002.
5. The Director Accounts, Postal,
A.P. Circle, HYDERABAD – 500 001 (TS).
6. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Hindupur Division, HINDUPUR – 515 201,
Anantapur District, AP.Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. B.Gurudas

Counsel for the Respondents : Ms.Megha Rani Agarwal, CGSC

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.SWARUP KUMAR MISHRA, JUDICIAL MEMBER

(Order per Hon'ble Mr.Swarup Kumar Mishra, Judicial Member)

(Order per Hon'ble Mr.Swarup Kumar Mishra, Judicial Member)

This application is filed under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985 to call for the records pertaining to the following impugned orders,

- 1) Denial of 50% of the minimum of the pay in the pay band plus the grade pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale, as Pension ;
- 2) OM No.F.No.38/37/08-P&PW(A), dated 22.07.2011;
- 3) Order No.AC/HDP/Pen/Misc/Pre-2006 Pension Revision dated 06.01.2017;

And declare the same as illegal, arbitrary and against the rules and principles of natural justice and in violation of the Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, set aside and quash the said illegal orders with consequential directions to the respondents to grant 50% of the minimum of the pay in the pay band plus the grade pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale as pension as per OM, dated 01.09.2008 and revise the same from time to time as per rules and pass such other order or orders as the Tribunal deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant was initially appointed as Postal Assistant with effect from 06.05.1974 and subsequently promoted under Time Bound One Promotion Scheme (TBOP) with effect from 06.05.1991. The applicant was compulsorily retired with effect from 24.11.1999, as a result of disciplinary proceedings. By that time the applicant has completed more than 25 years of service. On compulsory retirement his pension was fixed at Rs.1,745/- per month with effect from

24.11.1999 on pro-rata basis and it was revised from time to time.

3. That, as per the recommendations of the VI-Central Pay Commission, vide OM No.38/37/08-P&PW(A), dated 01.09.2008 revised pension in no case shall be lower than 50% of the minimum of the pay and the pay band + grade pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scales, from which the pensioner had retired. According to this order, and orders issued subsequently, the applicant is eligible for 50% of last through representations, dated 29.10.2015, 12.12.2015, 27.03.2016 and 27.07.2016 and requested for revision of pension. In response to the applicant letter, dated 27.07.2016, the 4th respondent informed that there are no orders received for revision of pre-2006 pensions in respect of compulsory retirement pension cases as per the said OM vide letter No.AC/HDP/Pen/Misc/Pre-2006 Pension Revision, dated 06.01.2017 which is not correct.

4. The orders contained in OM dated 01.09.2008 are applicable to all pensioners and making discrimination is illegal. All pensioners have to be treated equally and the benefit has to be extended to them, as per Para-2-1 of OM dated 01.09.2008. In a similar case Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam vide judgment dated 07.01.2016 OP (CAT) No.2 of 2016 (Z) quashed the OM dated 22.07.2011 upheld the orders of the CAT Ernakulam and dismissed the Original Writ Petition as there was no merit in the contention of the respondents / applicants. In order words 50% of the minimum of the pay in the pay band plus the grade pay corresponding to

the pre-revised pay scale as pension, was allowed. The applicant is also eligible for this benefit and the respondents have to be directed to extend the benefit to him. Hence this application.

5. Respondents have not filed reply statement.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant, in support of his contentions, relied upon the following decisions :

i) OA No.640/2014 & Batch, dated 31.07.2015 of CAT, Ernakulam Bench in the case of Director Accounts (Postal), Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram-1 & Others ;

ii) D.S.Nakara & Others Vs. UoI, dated 17.12.1982 (1983 SCC (1) 305

7. The factual aspects are not disputed. In the decision relied on by the learned counsel for the applicant ie decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, dated 31.07.2015 between Director of Accounts (Postal), Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram-1 & 3 Ors Vs. N.Karthikeyan Pillai, Postal Assistant (Rtd), Vaisakh, Vellithode, Thrikkaipetta, Mepadi, Wayanad District-673 577 in OP (CAT)No.108/2016 (Z), it has been held as under :

“4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that the idea and understanding of the petitioners is thoroughly wrong and misconceived. The working in the resolution is categoric, which reads as follows :

“..... The fixation of pension will be subject to the provision that the revised pension, in no case, shall be lower than fifty percent of the sum of the minimum of the pay in the pay band and the grade pay thereon corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale from which the pensioner had retired.”

It is stated that the said position is quite mandatory, and exception; is drawn in no case. As such, whether the respondent was made to compulsorily retire from service, was not at all to be considered for granting the minimum pension at 50%.”

The said judgment was passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in which the judgment passed by the Ernakulam Bench of CAT in OA No.640/2014, dated 31.07.2015 was challenged. The said decision is fully applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case. The Respondents cannot take the plea that no such circular, as per the decision passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala or the CAT, Ernakulam Bench, has been passed by the DoPT. It has also been held by the judgment of the Ernakulam Bench of CAT as under :-

“10. Issues raised in these O.As stand covered by the above decisions of the Tribunal, High Court and Supreme Court. We do not find any reason to add to the judgment already delivered in a similar adjudicated matter. Any modification of the Cabinet resolution by a subsequent administrative order is *ultara vires*. Accordingly, the OAs are allowed. The respondents are directed to issue revised Pension Payment Orders to the applicants in the OAs specifying that pension of pre-2006 retirees will be calculated on the basis of 50% of the minimum of the ay band plus grade pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale of the respective post held at the time of retirement, proportionate ;to the length of his service and fix higher of the two as pension with effect from 1.1.2006 and corresponding family pension and grant all consequential benefits including arrears of pension within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.”

Taking into consideration the said position of law and the binding precedents ie the decision of CAT,Ernakulam Bench, this Tribunal directs the Respondents to sanction similar benefit to the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

8. The Respondents shall extend the consequential service and financial benefits to the applicant. The Original Application is accordingly allowed. No order as to costs.

(SWARUP KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

Dated : 29th November, 2018.

vl