

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.1128/2019

Friday, this the 3rd day of May 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Shri Bal Krishan Trikha aged about 78 1/2 years
s/o late Shri Chunni Lal Trikha presently
retired SW Gp 'A' Gazetted Defence Civilian
Officer superannuated w.e.f. 10.07.1997 pre-
maturely on VRS from MES under E-in-C's
Branch AHQ Ministry of Defence last posted in
CE (AF) Allahabad
r/o 32 Begum Bagh, Bhopal
Singh Marg,
Meerut (UP)

..Applicant
(Mr. V P S Tyagi, Advocate)

Versus

1. The Union of India
(through Secretary)
Ministry of Defence
South Block,
New Delhi – 110 001
2. The Engineer-in-Chief (MES)
E-in-C's Branch AHQ
Kashmere House, Rajaji Marg
New Delhi – 110 011
3. The Controller General of Defence Accounts
(CGDA)
Ulan Batar Marg
Palam Delhi Cantt.110010

..Respondents
(Mrs. Harvinder Oberoi, Advocate for respondent No.1)

O R D E R (ORAL)**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**

The only prayer made in this O.A. is that the respondents be directed to pass orders on the representation made by the applicant on 10.09.2018. The said representation was made in the light of the observations made in the order dated 04.07.2018 passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No.2432/2018.

2. We heard Mr. V P S Tyagi, learned counsel for applicant and Mrs. Harvinder Obveroi, learned counsel for respondent No.1.

3. The applicant took voluntary retirement from Military Engineering Service in the year 1997. He submitted a detailed representation claiming some benefits said to be on par with those being extended to his juniors. It is not known as to whether the comparison is with reference to the emoluments while in service or the pensionary benefits after retirement. Further, there is long delay in making it. The question as to whether the claim of the applicant needs to be considered or entertained has to be examined by the respondents. Merely seven months have elapsed ever since the representation was made.

4. We, therefore, dispose of the O.A. directing the respondents to pass order on the representation within a period

of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. We make it clear that if the claim is otherwise stale or untenable, the disposal of the O.A. shall not be treated as an expression of view on limitation.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

May 3, 2019
/sunil/