

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI
OA No. 2647/2017**

New Delhi, this the 08th day of March, 2019

Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar Member (A)

Shri U. Rai Arya, Group C
S/o Late Sh. Govind Prasad,
Aged about 81 years
R/o 3H-64, Nehru Nagar
Ghaziabad

.....Applicant

(By advocate : Mr Yogesh Kumar Mahur)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through its Secretary,
Department of Telecommunication, Sanchar Bhawan,
Patel Chowk, 20 Ashoka Road,
New Delhi
2. The Member (Staff)
Telecommunication Commissioner,
Room No. 505, 20 Ashoka Road,
New Delhi-110 001
3. Chief General Manager, Telecom,
Rajasthan Telecom Circle,
Jaipur 302008

.....Respondents

(By advocate : Mr Subhash Gosain for R 1& 2 and Mr Sarfaraz Khan for R 3)

O R D E R (O R A L)

Mr. Pradeep Kumar Member (A):

1. Mr Yogesh Kumar Mahur learned counsel appeared for the applicant and Mr Subhash Gosain learned counsel appeared for the respondents no 1 & 2 and Mr Sarfaraz Khan learned counsel appeared for the respondent no 3.

2. In the instant OA, the applicant was aggrieved that he is required to be paid certain amounts as part of GPF.
3. The respondents appointed a committee comprising of Sr. Accounts Officers to go through the record pertaining to the provident fund account of the applicant. This committee came to a conclusion that instead of paying to the applicant, an amount of Rs 22,309/- is actually required to be recovered from the applicant as of 31.05.2013.
4. During the hearing on 23.08.2018, the respondents were directed to make available the records of the GPF for inspection by the applicant. This inspection has since been done by the son of applicant. The relevant records were also produced by the respondents for perusal of the court. Attention was drawn to the Last Pay Certificate (LPC) of year 1985. That LPC also showed recovery of about Rs. 24,000/- from the applicant.
5. It was accordingly pleaded by respondents that there are no missing entries and recovery actually pertains to prior to year 1985 or so and this needs to be implemented as per review of entire record undertaken at the time of retirement. Accordingly, nothing subsists in this OA.
6. Matter has been heard at length. In view of foregoing factual information, there is nothing left to be adjudicated in this matter. Nothing subsists in this OA. The same stands dismissed. No costs.

**(Mr. Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)**

neetu