

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

**O.A No. 180/00379/2015
&
O.A No. 180/00878/2014**

Thursday , this the 13th day of December, 2018

CORAM:

**HON'BLE Mr. E.K. BHARAT BHUSHAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE Mr. ASHISH KALIA, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

O.A No. 180/00379/2015

1. U. Rajaram, S/o. Kunhiraman, aged 67 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 25265,
residing at T C1/889, Station Kadavu, Kazhakuttom,
Trivandrum – 695 008.
2. S. Ramachandran Nair, S/o. K. Sankara Pillai, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 25040,
residing at T C 2/1481, Attinkuzhi, Kazhakuttom,
Trivandrum – 695 582.
3. C. Gopalakrishnan, S/o. S. Chandran Chettiar, aged 68 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 21629,
residing at T C 55/691, Santhosh Nagar, iramankara,
Trivandrum – 695 018.
4. M. Balan Nambiar, S/o. N.V. Kunhiraman Nambiar, aged 68 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 70507,
residing at 11/260, Ashramam Cross Road, Kalady P.O.,
Ernakulam – 683 574.
5. V.N. Raveendran, S/o. Neelakantan, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 25182,
residing at T C 3/2404, Marapalam, Pattom,
Trivandrum – 695 004.
6. S. Kalyani Ammal, W/o. R. Hariharan, aged 62 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 22862,
residing at T C 38/385, Valiasala Street, Trivandrum – 695 036.
7. Elizabeth Jose, W/o. L. Josekutty aged 64 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 21320,
residing at T C 29/351, MRA-116, Thengapura Lane,
Trivandrum – 695 024.
8. Elsy Fernandez, W/o. Johnson Fernandez, aged 65 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 21315,
residing at “Poomuttom”, Space Gardens, Arasummoodu,
Trivandrum – 695 583.

9. P.L. Radha, W/o. V.K. Radhakrishnan, aged 67 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 24921, residing at VNRA-36, "Swagath", Chakalamukku, Sreekriam, Trivandrum – 695 017.
10. V. Vanaja, W/o. Jagadishan, aged 62 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 27862, Residing at 121, AKG Nagar, Peroorkada, Trivandrum – 695 005. Applicants

[By Advocate Mr. S.Narayanan Nair]

v e r s u s

1. Union of India represented by Secretary, Department of Space, Govt. of India, Antariksha Bhavan, New BEL Road, Bangalore, Pin – 560 094.
2. Secretary, Department of Personnel and Training, Govt. of India, North Block, New Delhi – 110 001.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India, New Delhi – 110 001.
4. Director, Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre, ISRO-P.O., Thiruvananthapuram – 695 022. Respondents

[By Advocate : Mr. N. Anilkumar, SCGSC]

O.A No. 180/00878/2014

1. K.V. Thomas, S/o. Joseph Varkey, aged 67 years, Retired Scientist/ Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 27435, residing at TC 28/541, Kaithamukku, Thiruvananthapuram – 695 024.
2. N. Sadasivan, S/o. K. Neelakantan, aged 67 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, PPFF, MEE, VSSC, SC No. 35988, residing at Ranny Lane, Peroorkada, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. M.A. Abraham, S/o. Yohannan Abraham, aged 67 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 20171, residingat TC 4/1788, Engineering College P.O., Thiruvananthapuram
4. P.V. Prabhakaran, S/o. Chandu Nair, aged 65 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 24479, residing at No. 35, Rose Nagar, Thiruvananthapuram.
5. R. Baskaran Nair, S/o. N. Raman Pillai, aged 66 years,

Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 20662,
residing at TC 17/1924 (2), Kesari Road,
Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram – 12.

6. L.K. Anand Kumar, S/o. L.V. Krishnaji Rao, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 20138,
residing at 79/152(4), Krishna Gardens,
Karikakom, Thiruvananthapuram – 7.
7. Vijayalakshmi T., D/o. Tharu Velayudhan Nair, aged 65 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 28025, TC 1/6345,
SBI Road, Kazhakuttom, Thiruvananthapuram.
8. K.P. Thanki, W/o.K.V. John, aged 67 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC,
SC No. 27425, residing at B5, Immu Apartments,
Kuravankonam, Thiruvananthapuram.
9. P.L. Rahelamma, W/o.I M.J. Koshy, aged 67 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 25140,
residing at TC 4/2557, Kuravankonam,
Thiruvananthapuram.
10. Sundari C.S. W/o. M. Ragava Iyer, aged 61 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 26271,
residing at T.C. 36/960, Perunthani,
Thiruvananthapuram – 8.
11. John. J. Kurian, S/o. V.I. Kurian, aged 68 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No,
22781, residing at CRRA-36, TC2/3422,
Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram -4.
12. Padma Jasmin Stanley, W/o. G.P. Stanly, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 24333,
residing at MBRRA-46/11, Rohini, Vanchiyoor,
Thiruvananthapuram.
13. P.J. Cherian, S/o. P.C. Joseph, aged 64 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 20994,
residing at TC 7/1981, Bridge Lane, Ulloor,
MCG-P.O., Thiruvananthapuram.
14. R. Padmanabha Pillai, S/o. Ramakrishna Pillai, aged 67 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 14313, residing
at TC 26/1654 (1), Pulimoodu, Thiruvananthapuram.
15. K.N.N. Nampoothiri, S/o. Narayanan Namboothiri,
aged 68 years, Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC,
SC No. 24018, residing at TC 27/1127,
Vanchiyoor, Thiruvananthapuram.
16. Sidhardhan S., S/o. Srinivasan R., aged 65 years,

Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 26290,
residing at Flat No. 8F, Nikunjam Orient,
Poonthi Road, Kumarapuram, Thiruvananthapuram.

17. C.J. Varkey, S/o. Varkey Joseph, aged 63 years,
Retired Scientist/ Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 27946,
residing at TC 6/196(6), Vattiyoorkavu, Thiruvananthapuram.
18. K.V. Sreekumar, V/o. Velayudhan Tampi, aged 68 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 26055,
residing at TC 27/2356, Convent Road, Thiruvananthapuram -1.
19. K. Krishnankutty Nair, S/o. I.K. Narayanan air, aged 67 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 91109,
residing at TC 42/1440(7), Sreevaraha Nagar No. 36,
Vallakadavu, Thiruvananthapuram -8.\
20. K. Gururaj Ugrani, S/o. Srinivasa Urgani, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No, 21622,
residing at Sreepadam, 7/67(U), Behind Kannarddy
Temple, Kadaitkar-P.O., Udipi – 576 103.
21. P.K. Govindan Potti, S/o. Prof. P.G. Kesavan Potti, aged 54 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 21761,
residing at TC 17/410(1), Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram.
22. S. Remani, W/o. K. Bahulayan Nair, aged 65 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer SE, VSSC, SC No. 25102,
residing at TC 9/1903(1), Sasthamangalam,
Thiruvananthapuram -10.
23. P.C. Annie, W/o. V.K. Joseph, aged 66 years,
Retired Scientist/Engineer, VSSC, Staff Code No. 20160,
residing at APRA-217, Pully Lane, Pettah,
Thiruvananthapuram – 24. Applicants

[By Advocate Mr. S.Narayanan Nair]

v e r s u s

1. Union of India represented by Secretary, Department of Space,
Govt. of India, Antariksha Bhavan, New BEL Road,
Bangalore, Pin – 560 094.
2. Secretary, Department of Personnel and Training,
Govt. of India, North Block, New Delhi – 110 001.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Finance,
Govt. of India, New Delhi – 110 001.
4. Director, Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre,
ISRO-P.O., Thiruvananthapuram – 695 022. Respondents

[By Advocate : Mr. N. Anilkumar, SCGSC]

The applications having been heard on 07.12.2018 , this Tribunal on 13.12.2018 delivered the following:

O R D E R

Per: Ashish Kalia, Judicial Member:

Both these Original Applications via. O.A. 180/379/2015 and OA.180/878/2014 have been heard together as the reliefs sought are identical and common question of law are involved and the respondents are same. For the sake of brevity and convenience both the O.A.s are being disposed of by this common order.

2. O.A.No.180/ 379/2015 is taken up first as the leading case and brief facts of the case in both cases are though similar and identical, reference is made in relation to O.A. 180/379/2015. Therefore, the decision so arrived at by this Tribunal in O.A. 180/379/2015 will be *mutatis mutandis* applicable to O.A. No. 180/878/2014 as well.

3. Applicants are retired Scientist/Engineers SE/SF from the 4th respondent organisation, Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre (VSSC for short) under the 1st respondent Department of Space, Govt. of India. They were all serving in the grade of 12000-16500 (S-21) in the 5th Central Pay Commission (5th CPC for short) fixation. They were drawing more than Rs. 14,300/- as basic pay as on 1.1.2006 and have retired from service after 1.1.2006.

2. The 6th Central Pay Commission (6thCPC) report was implemented in the year 2008 w.e.f. 1.1.2006 with effect from 1.1.2006. It was clearly mentioned in para 2.2.21 of the 6th CPC report that “ No person drawing a higher basic pay in any 5th Central Pay Commission scales is fixed lower vis-a-vis a person drawing a lower basic pay irrespective of pay scale.” The 6th CPC has further highlighted the need for implementation of the recommendations in whole as otherwise it would lead to various anomalies in the fixation. The recommendations under para 2.2.21 were deliberately included to achieve the objective of avoiding anomalies in fixation and consequent heart burns to affected persons and also to maintain the morale of the service apart from equity considerations. But the operational instructions issued by the Government in the implementation of the 6th pay

commission report totally ignored the above recommendations in respect of S21 resulting in a situation where many officials drawing less basic pay than the applicants under 5th CPC in the grade of 14300-18300 (S24) were fixed at a higher basic pay under 6th CPC. The built in protection under para 2.2.21 was ignored and the fixation formula was thus violative of the principle enunciated in para 2-2-21 of the 6th Pay commission recommendations.

3. It is further submitted that the basic pay of Rs. 16500/- in S21 is fixed at Rs. 38290/- in PB 3 and a basic pay of Rs. 16300/- in S24 is fixed at Rs. 48390/- in PB4 evidently showing there by that an official drawing less Basic Pay under 5th CPC fixation is getting more than an official getting under 5 CPC after the implementation of 6CPC which is violative of the built in safe guards against anomaly and injustice. It has resulted in violation of the principles of natural justice.

4. The 6th CPC had designed PB4 as Rs.39400-67000 above PB3 to start everybody in the senior administration grade at the same stage. S24, S25 and S26 were as per 6th CPC report in PB3. But the Govt. modified PB4 to s.37400-67000 and placed S24, S25 and S26 in PB4. This modification had altered the 6th CPC that PB4 should begin above PB3. While making the amendment, the recommendations under para 2.2.21 were given a go-by resulting in fixation anomalies.

5. Personnel in S21 and S24 have almost similar duties and responsibilities and as such there is no reason for such huge difference in fixation of Rs. 16500/- in S21 and Rs.38290/- and Rs. 16300/- in S24 as Rs. 48390/-. There is a difference of Rs. 16180/- between adjacent grades S21and S24 in the starting pay under 6th CPC, whereas in the previous central pay commission fixations, the difference was much less. There is no justification for the huge difference. This is unfair, illogical and arbitrary apart from being violative of the principles of natural justice.

6. Aggrieved by the above anomaly several representations were submitted to the respondents with no avail.

7. The President of the ISRO Pensioners Association submitted a memorandum to the 2nd respondent requesting to fix 5th central pay commission basic pay of above Rs. 14300/-

as per fixation norms of PB4 so as to uphold the principles enshrined in 6th CPC report 2.2.21. Aggrieved by this the applicants in both the OAs approached this Tribunal for redressal of their grievance with the following reliefs sought:

- “ (i) To call for the records leading to Annexure A9 reply, examine the legality and propriety and quash the same.
- (ii) To declare that the applicants notwithstanding in S21 are entitled to fixation as per para 2.2.21 of 6th Central Pay Commission report applying the same formula as applied to S24 based on the modified fitment table in Annexure A3.
- (iii) To direct respondents to grant all consequent benefits on fixation as per para 2.2.21 of the 6th Central Pay Commission report to the applicants.

8. Notices were issued and the respondents put their appearance through Mr.N.Anilkumar, Sr.PCGC and filed detailed reply statement opposing the O.A.

9. It is submitted on behalf of the respondents that the applicants have essentially sought to compare pay fixation between two different pay scales- one lower (S-21) and the other higher (S-24) by relying upon one observation of the 6th CPC. On the one hand, while comparing two different pay scales for the same benefit is not well founded as similarity between two different and unequal pay scales is neither appropriate nor possible and, on the other hand, the particularly observation of the 6th CPC, as relied upon by the petitioners, which is contained in para 2.2.21 (iv) is no longer relevant in the light of the decisions of the Government on the recommendations of the Commission, as finally accepted by the Government with modifications having regard to relevant factors.

10. The 6th CPC, while recommending pay structure for the Central Govt. Employees, made a significant departure from the structure of pay scales obtaining earlier. The structure of pay scales obtaining prior to 6 th CPC contained specific pay scales attached to each specific post. The 6th CPC, however, did away with the concept of specific pay scales and recommended for a system of running Pay Bands with elongated spans. The Commission observed that a conscious departure has been made in recommending running

Pay Bands because of the inherent advantages of such pay scales.

11. The running Pay Bands recommended by the Pay Commission subsumed a number of pre-revised pay scales, both in the feeder and promotional hierarchy. The Commission, accordingly, grouped 34 pre-revised pay scales into 4 Pay Bands as under in para 2.2.18 of its report as under:

S.No.	Pre revised pay scales	Pay Band
1	S-1 to S-8	Pay Band 1 (Rs. 4860-20200)
2	S-9 to S-15	Pay Band 2 (8700-34800)
3	S-16 to S-27	Pay Band 3 (15600-39100)
4	S-28 to S-32	Pay Band 4 (39200-67000)

12. While recommending for the system of running Pay Bands which amalgamated a number of pre-revised pay scales as submitted above, the Commission also recommended a system of Grade Pay, which is a fixed amount attached to each post in the hierarchy. The Commission recommended that the Grade Pay will determine the status of a post with a senior post being given higher Grade Pay. In this Annexure R3 extracts of para 2.2.11 of the report of the Commission is produced by the respondents. Therefore, the Commission recommended a special formula for fitment, which essentially meant that the basic pay drawn as on 1.1.2006 in the existing pre-revised pay scales, was to be multiplied by 1.74 and then rounded off to the next multiple of 10. This was to be taken as pay in the running Pay Band. In addition, the Grade Pay was to be added.

13. It is further submitted that while recommending for such a fitment formula that the Commission in para 2.2.21 observed as under:

“ It has also been ensured that a person drawing higher basic pay in any 5th CPC pay scale is not fitted lower vis-a-vis a person drawing a lower basic pay irrespective of the pay scale.”

14. It is further submitted that since the Commission recommended a multiple of 1.74 to be applied on the pre-revised basic pay in all the pre-revised pay scales uniformly for fitment in the revised pay structure, it is obvious that a particular stage of basic pay is bound to be fixed/fitted at a stage higher than that applicable to a lower basic pay. It is in this context that the Commission observed as mentioned in para 3.11 above. Moreover, in

para 4. of the O.A., the applicants have rephrased the above observation as under:

”No person drawn a higher basic pay in any 5th Central Pay Commission scale is fixed lower vis-a-vis a person drawing lower basic pay irrespective of the pay scale.”

15. While considering the recommendations made by the 6th Central Pay Commission as part of implementation thereof, the Government made a number of improvements/modifications therein, including the fitment formula recommended by the Commission as well as fitment of certain pay scale in a higher Pay Band than what was recommended by the Commission. The main improvements made by the Commission in this regard which has a bearing on the fitment formula are as under;

(i) The fitment multiple of 1.74, as recommended by the Commission, was enhanced to 1.86.

(ii) The minimum pay in the following Pay Bands was modified as under:

Pay Band	As recommended by the Commission	As modified by the Government
PB-1	4860-20200	5200-20200
PB-2	8700-34800	9300-34800
PB-4	39200-67000	37400-67000

(iii) The quantum of Grade Pay recommended by the Commission was improved upon as under;

S.No.	Grade Pay as recommended by the commission	Grade Pay as improved by the Government.
1	6100	6600
2	6500	6600
3	7500	7600
4.	7600 in PB-3	8700 in PB-4
5.	8300 in PB3	8700 in PB 4.

(iv) The four pre-revised pay scale (S24, S-25, S-26, & S-27) which were recommended by the Commission to be placed in Pay Band 3, were upgraded by the Government for placement in PB.4.

3.15 Thus, so far as the pre-revised pay scales of S.21 and S.24, which are in contention

here, underwent change and modifications as under:

Pre-revised pay Scale	Recommendation by the 6 th Pay Commission		Decision of the government	
	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay
S-21 (12000-16500)	PB-3	6600	P.B.3	7600
S-24 (14300-18300)	PB.3	7600	PB4	8700
S-25 (15100-18300)	PB3	8300	PB4	8700
S-26 (16400-20000)	PB3	8400	PB4	8900
S-27 (16400-20900)	PB3	8400	PB4	8900

16. Consequent upon the improvement in the fitment multiple from 1.74 as recommended by the Commission to 1.86 as decided by the Government, the fixation/fitment formula as prescribed in Rule 7 (1) (A) (I) of the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008 provides for fixation in the revised Pay Band by multiplying the “existing pay” (pre-revised pay as on 1.1.2006) by 1.86 times, rounded off to the next multiple of 10.

Respondents have cited the order of the Principal Bench in O.A. No. 971/2012 and connected cases dated 28.01.2015 in which it was held as under:

“...that Pay Commission is a recommendatory body and it is not incumbent on the Government to accept its recommendations in toto, and that they have a right to modify the same before implementation wherever considered necessary for administrative reasons or otherwise. This contention of the respondents has not been disputed by the applicants themselves. We also find merit in the same.

In view of the above, we find that there is no merit in this O.A. and the same is dismissed. No costs.”

17. The applicants filed the rejoinder and the respondents filed additional rejoinder.

18. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties at length and perused the pleadings and case law cited by the learned counsel for the respondents.

19. The grievance of the applicants in both these O.As is that the recommendation of the 6th CPC para 2.2.21 has not been implemented and persons who are in the pay scale of Rs.16300/- were fixed at S.24 with basic of Rs. 48390/- in PB4 . The persons having basic pay of rs. 16300/- in S24 is fixed at Rs. 48390/- in PB4. Whereas as per the 5th CPC recommendation Rs.16500/- was in S.21 fixed at Rs. 38290/- in Pay Band No. 3. This anomaly has been caused by not following the 2.2.21 recommendation of the 6th CPC. The respondents have given reply that the recommendation of the 6th CPC has not been accepted in toto and certain modifications have been done. Firstly, the fitment multiplication factor of 1.74 as recommended by the 6th CPC was enhanced to 1.86 and pay band was also refixed as per the duties and responsibilities of the posts. The applicant cannot make any comparison while acceptance of the report of the 6th CPC with modification by the Government. In view of this, Principal Bench of this Tribunal has already decided this issue in O.A. No. 971/2012 vide order dated 28.01.2015 wherein after considering numerous judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court such as *Balco Employees Union (Regd) v. UOI 2002 (2) SCC 333* wherein it has been observed that wisdom and advisability of economic policy are ordinarily not amenable to judicial review unless it can be demonstrated that constitutional limits have been transgressed and the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Federation of All India Customs and Central Excise Stenographers (Recognised) v. Union of India (1988)3 SCC 91* wherein it has been held that differentiation is justified in view of the nature and types of the work done. The problem about equal pay for equal work cannot always be translated into a mathematical formula. In the order of the PB (supra) it was also referred the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *State of Haryana v. Jasmer Singh & Ors, AIR 1997 Sc 1788* have stated that in the aforesaid case it has been observed that judgement of administrative authorities concerning the responsibilities attached to the post would be a valuable judgement, if arrived at in a *bonafide* manner and would not be open to interference.

20. Another judgment cited in the order of PB (supra) is *S.C. Chandra & Ors. v. State of Jharkhand and Ors. 2007 AIR 3021* wherein it has been held that fixing of pay scales by

Courts by applying the principle of separation of powers between the three organs of the State, and therefore, this Court has in recent years avoided applying this principle unless there was complete and wholesale identity between the two groups and then to the matter has been sent for examination by an Expert Committee to be appointed by the Government instead of Court granting higher pay.

21. In the conspectus of the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the legal position settled by a *catena* of judgments by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as cited above, we are of the considered opinion that it is not incumbent on the Government to accept CPC recommendations *in toto* and that they have a right to modify the same before implementation wherever considered necessary for administrative reasons or otherwise.

Courts cannot interfere unless and until the principle laid down herein above are violated.

22. In the results, O.A. No. 379/2015 is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

23. The decision which we have arrived at in O.A. 180/379/2015 is *mutatis mutandis* is applicable to the reliefs sought by the applicants in O.A.No.180/878/2014. Accordingly it is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

(E.K. BHARAT BHUSHAN)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

sj*

Applicants Annexures'in OA. No. 180/379/2015

Annexure A9 - True copy of reply to annexure A8 representation received from the Fourth Respondent bearing No.VSSC/EST/E-PEN/25265/1108 dated 23.1.2015.

Annexure A1 - True copy of fixation table for S21 under 6th Central Pay Commission report.

Annexure A2 - True copy of the fixation table for S24 under the 6th CPC

Annexure A3 - Modified fixation table for S21 as per para 2.2.21.

Annexure A4 - True copy of table showing the difference between S21 and S24 in the previous CPC reports.

Annexure A5 - True copy of letter No.VSSC/EST/E-PEN/27435/1251dated 30.7.2013 from R4 to Mr. K.V.Thomas

Annexure A6 - True copy of memorandum No. ISRO PA/DPT/61/2013 dated 5.9.2013 submitted to R2 by the President of ISRO Pensioners Association.

Annexure A7 - True copy of reply from R3 to the President of ISRO Pensioners Association rejecting A6 Memorandum.

Annexure A8 - Representation dated 15-10-2014 submitted to R4 by the first applicant.

Annexures of Respondents in OA. 180/379/2015

Annexure R1 - True copy of the relevant extracts from para 1.2.7 & 1.2.8 of 6th CPC.

Annexure R2 - True copy of the relevant Extract from para 2.2.18 of the report of the 6th CPC.

Annexure R3 - True copy of the relevant Extract from para 2.2.11 of the report of the 6th CPC .

Annexure R4 - True copy of the relevant Extract from para 2.2.20, 2.2.21, & 2.2.22 of the report of the 6th CPC

Annexure R5 - True copy of the pre-revised pay scales of S-21 and S-24.

Annexure R6 - True copy of the resolution No.1/1/2008-IC dated 29.-08.2008.

Annexure R7 - True copy of the extract from Rule 7 of the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008.

Annexure R8 - True copy of the O.M. dated 30.08.2008.

Annexure R9 - True copy of the fitment table showing two pay scales.

Annexure R10 - True copy of the fitment table showing four pay scales.

Annexure R11 - True copy of the time scale of pay defined in FR 9 (31)

Annexure R.12 - True copy of the comparison of Defence forces and Civilian in 6th CPC

Annexure R13 - True copy of the order dated 28.01.2015 in OA No. 971 of 2012.

Applicants Annexures in OA No. 180/878/2014

Annexure A7 - True copy of letter dated 11.3.2014 from R3 to Ist applicant enclosing a copy of letter dated 7.3.2014 to the President of ISRO Pensioners Association.

Annexure A1 - True copy of fixation table for S21 under 6th Central Pay Commission report.

Annexure A2 - True copy of the fixation table for S24 under the 6th CPC

Annexure A3 - True copy of Modified fixation table for S21 as per para 2.2.21.

Annexure A4 - True copy of table showing the difference between S21 and S24 in the previous CPC.

Annexure A5 - True copy of letter No. VSSC/EST/E-PEN/27435/1251 dated 30.7.2013 from R4 to Ist applicant.

Annexure A6. - True copy of memorandum No. ISRO PA/DPT/61/2013 dated 5.9.2013 submitted to R2 by the President of ISRO Pensioners Association.

Annexures of Respondents in O.A. No.180/878/2014

Annexure R1 - True copy of the relevant extracts from para 1.2.7 & 1.2.8 of report of 6th CPC.

Annexure R2 - True copy of the relevant extract from para 2.2.18 of the report of the 6th CPC.

Annexure R3 - True copy of the relevant extract from para 2.2.11 of the report of the 6th CPC.

Annexure R4 - True copy of the relevant extract from para 2.2.20, 2.2.21, & 2.2.22 of the report of the 6th CPC

Annexure R5 - True copy of the table showing revised Pay band PB-3+ Grade Pay.

Annexure R6 - True copy of the resolution No. 1/1/2008-IC dated 29.-08.2008.

Annexure R7 - True copy of the extract from Rule 7 of the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008.

Annexure R8 - True copy of the O.M. dated 30.08.2008.

Annexure R9 - True copy of the fitment table two pay scales based on the formula improved by the Government.

Annexure R10 - True copy of the fitment table for four pay scales.

Annexure R11 - True copy of the extract from Swamy's Fundamental Rules 9(31)

Annexure R.12 - True copy of the extract from the report of the 6th CPC giving comparison of pay scales of Defence forces and Civilian.

Annexure R13 - True copy of the order dated 28.01.2015 in OA No. 971 of 2012. of the Principal Bench of this Hon'ble Tribunal.
