

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

O.A./100/2118/2015

New Delhi, this the 2nd day of May, 2019

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

S.A.A. Abbasi,  
S/o Late Shri M.B. Abbasi,  
Aged 63 years, Retd. Add. CPFC  
1123, Mantova, Mahagun Mansion  
Vaibhav Khand, Indirapuram  
Ghaziabad-201014

... Applicant

(Appeared in person)

Versus

1. Central Provident Fund Commissioner,  
Bhavishya Nidhi Bhawan,  
EPF Organization  
Ministry of Labour & Employment  
14, Bhikaji Cama Place,  
New Delhi-110066
2. Chief Vigilance Officer  
Vigilance Wing, EPF Organization  
Ministry of Labour & Employment  
15, Bhikaji Cama Place,  
New Delhi-110066
3. S.C. Sharma  
Permanent Inquiry Officer (NZ)  
Bhavishya Nidhi Bhawan,  
EPF Organization  
Ministry of Labour & Employment  
14, Bhikaji Cama Place,  
New Delhi-110066

... Respondents

(Through Shri Puneet Garg, Advocate)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

This OA is filed by a retired employee with a prayer to issue direction to the respondents to allow him to assist the employees, who are facing disciplinary proceedings. Reference is made to certain charge sheets.

2. The applicant contends that disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the four employees of the Employees Provident Fund Organization (EPFO) and when they made a request to avail his i.e. applicant's assistance, the same was not permitted. Placing reliance upon certain clauses contained in the EPF (CCA) Rules, he contends that even a retired person can be permitted to assist employees and the same is co-extensive with the rights of the charged employees.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submitted that the applicant cannot be said to be an aggrieved person much less he has any enforceable right.

4. The case was argued at some length. We pointed out that the applicant can derive a right only from the specific provision of law. It was also observed that even if

such right exists, it should be only in the service conditions and not otherwise. When these aspects were indicated, the applicant sought permission of the Tribunal to withdraw the OA.

5. Accordingly, the OA is dismissed as withdrawn.

(Aradhana Johri)  
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)  
Chairman

/dkm/