

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.4120/2018  
MA No.2547/2019**

New Delhi, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**

Kuldeep Kumar  
Aged about 53 years,  
R/o Shri Vasudev Verma,  
R/o 43, Type-II, Varun Kunj,  
Sec-5, Rohini, Delhi Cantt.  
Group-C,  
Working as Pump Operator. ... Applicant.

(By Advocate : Shri Satwant Singh Munde, Shri Keshav Rai  
and Ms. Ruchi Munjal)

Vs.

1. Chief Executive Officer  
Delhi Jal Board,  
Varunalya Phase II,  
Karol Bagh, Delhi 110 005.
2. The Assistant Commissioner (G)-I  
Delhi Jal Board : Delhi Sarkar  
O/o Assistant Commissioner (L&E)  
Varunalya Phase-II,  
Karol Bagh, New Delhi 110 005. .... Respondents.

**: O R D E R (ORAL) :**

The applicant is an employee of Delhi Jal Board, and he was allotted a government accommodation. However, on finding that he sublet the same, an order was passed on 09.05.2014 requiring him to vacate the quarter. The said order is challenged in this OA.

2. The applicant contends that the allegation that he sublet the premise is factually incorrect and that there was no basis for order of eviction. Though the applicant prayed for interim relief, it was not granted and he accordingly vacated the premises.

3. During the pendency of the OA, the respondents issued a notice for recovery on 17.05.2019. Through that, the concerned authority was directed to prepare a recovery statement of license fee. The applicant filed MA No.2547/2019 in this behalf.

4. Heard Shri Satwant Singh Munde, Shri Keshav Rai and Ms. Ruchi Munjal, learned counsel for the applicant.

5. The HRA of the applicant is not being released on the ground that some recovery is sought to be made. From the perusal of the notice dated 17.05.2019, it is evident that the respondents are yet to determine as to what exactly is the amount to be recovered from the applicant. That being the situation they cannot withhold the HRA, once the applicant is not occupying any official accommodation.

6. The OA and the MA are accordingly disposed of directing the respondents to release the HRA of the applicant. It is, however, made clear that in case the applicant is liable to pay any amount referable to the

quarter when it was under his occupation, it shall be open for them to recover the same duly serving notice upon him. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)  
Chairman**

/pj/