

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**OA No.1170/2017**  
MA No. 1266/2017

New Delhi this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of January, 2019

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)**

1. Shri Mal Chand, Age 58 years, Group-C  
S/o late Shri Fagun Lal,  
Pointsman  
North-Western Railway,  
Under Station Superintendent Bikaner  
R/o Sangiri Kuan, Ranghu Nath Ji Ka Mandir  
VPO Bikaner, Distt. Bikaner
2. Shri Hamant Swamy, Age 34 years, Group-C  
S/o Shri Mal Chand  
R/o T-3, Railway Station Napasar                         ....Applicants

(By Advocate: Mr. HK Bajpai for Ms. Meenu Mainee)

Versus

Union of India : Through

1. Secretary  
Railway Board, Ministry of Railways  
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. General Manager,  
North-Western Railway, Jaipur
3. Divisional Railway Manager,  
North-Western Railway, Bikaner                         .... Respondents.

(By Advocate: Mr. Krishna Kan t Sharma)

**O R D E R (Oral)**

**Ms. Nita Chowdhury:**

MA No. 1266/2017 for joining together is allowed for the reasons stated therein.

2. The applicants have filed this Original Application (OA) claiming the following reliefs:-

“8.1 That the Hon'ble Tribunal may be graciously pleased to allow this application and quash the impugned orders

No.E(P&A)I-2016/RT-1 dated 07.10.2016 and No. 818-E/R&T/LARSGESS dated 29.06.2016.

- 8.2 That the Hon'ble Tribunal may also be graciously pleased to direct the respondents to accept the voluntary retirement of applicant no.1 and give appointment to applicant no.2 because they were declared eligible and therefore, were subjected to selection process as well as medical examination.
- 8.3 That the Hon'ble Tribunal may further graciously be pleased to pass any other or further order as may be deemed fit and proper on the facts and circumstances of the case.
- 8.4 That the Hon'ble Tribunal may further be graciously pleased to grant costs against the respondents and in favour of the applicant."

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, both the counsel for the parties are present.

4. In a similar case, i.e. OA No. 960/2016 (**Pala Ram v. Union of India & Ors.**), it is found that the Railway Board, vide its letter No.E(P&A)I-2015/RT-43 dated 26.09.2018, has terminated the LARSGESS Scheme in view of directions of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 508/2018 dated 08.01.2018. The said order of the Railway Board reads as under:-

"Sub: Termination of the LARSGESS Scheme in view of directions of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No. 508/2018 dated 08.01.2018.

Ref: Board's letter of even number dated 27.10.2017.

The Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in its judgment dated 27.04.16 in CWP No. 7714 of 2016 had held that the Safety Related Retirement Scheme 2004 (later renamed as the Liberalised Active Retirement Scheme for Guaranteed Employment for Safety Staff (LARSGESS, 2010) "*prima facie does not stand to the test of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India*" It had directed "*before making any appointment under the offending policy, let its validity and sustainability be revisited keeping in view the principles of equal*

*opportunity and elimination of monopoly in holding public employment.”* Thereafter, in its judgment dated 14.07.17 (Review Petition RA-CW-330-2017 in CWP No. 7714 of 2016), the Hon’ble High Court reiterated its earlier direction and stated “such a direction was necessitated keeping in view the mandate of the Constitution Bench in State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, (2006) 4 SCC 1.”

1.1 *In the Appeal against the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, while disposing of the SLP (C) No. 508/2018 vide its order dt. 8.01.18, declined to interfere with the directions of the High Court.*

2. In compliance with the above directions, Ministry of Railways have revisited the scheme duly obtaining legal opinion and consulted Ministry of Law & Justice. Accordingly, it has been decided to terminate the LARSGESS Scheme w.e.f. 27.10.2017 i.e. the date from which it was put on hold. No further appointments should be made under the Scheme except in cases where employees have already retired under the LARSGESS Scheme before 27.10.17 (but not normally superannuated) and their wards could not be appointed due to the Scheme having been put on hold in terms of Board’s letter dated 27.10.17 though they had successfully completed the entire process and were found medically fit. All such appointments should be made with the approval of the competent authority.”

5. From the facts of this case, it is clear that the respondents had not granted the request of the applicant to be considered for voluntary retirement and that as per Para 2 of the aforesaid Railway Board’s letter, the scheme of LARSGESS has now been terminated w.e.f. 27.10.2017.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, nothing remains to be adjudicated in this matter and the OA is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(S.N. Terdal)**  
**Member (J)**

**(Nita Chowdhury)**  
**Member (A)**