

A8

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA 310/01278/2015

Dated Wednesday the 15th day of November Two Thousand Seventeen

P R E S E N T

HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)

A. Jeyaraj
37, Muthamil Nagar 2nd Street
P&T Nagar North
Madurai 625 017.

... Applicant

By Advocate **M/s. K.K. Senthilvelan**
Vs.

1. The Chief General Manager
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited
Tamil Nadu Circle
16, Greams Road
Chennai 600 006.

2. The General Manager, BSNL
Madurai Telecom District
B.B. Kulam, Madurai 625 002.

3. The Accounts Officer (TA)
O/o. The General Manager, BSNL
Madurai – 625 002.

4. Mr. K. Subbukalai
Account Officer
O/o. The General Manager, BSNL
Madurai 625 002.

5. Mr. Shahul Hameed, TSO
Personal Claim Section
O/o. The General Manager, BSNL
Madurai 625 002.

... Respondents

By Advocate **Mr. S. Gopinathan**

OA 310/01278/2015

ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member(A))

Heard.

2. The applicant has filed this OA for medical reimbursement for in-patient treatment of his wife for respiratory distress at Apollo, Madurai and Kerala Institute of medical Science, Trivandrum from 21.5.2013 to 23.5.2013 and from 6.7.2013 to 14.7.2013 respectively. It is submitted that the applicant paid all hospital charges amounting to Rs. 25,816/- and Rs. 90,130/- respectively and submitted the bills to the General Manager, BSNL., Madurai for reimbursement. However, he was reimbursed only Rs. 12,619/- and Rs. 25,534/- respectively at CGHS rates for the year 2010 instead of revised rates approved in the year 2012.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant had no grievance about the reimbursement being restricted to CGHS rates. However, having agreed to reimburse the claims at the CGHS rates, the respondents ought to have applied the correct CGHS rates and not the old rates approved in the year 2010. He accordingly seeks appropriate directions in this regard.
4. Learned counsel for the respondents would, however, submit that

CGHS rates for various types of illnesses and treatment were prescribed in the year 2010. Thereafter rates were revised in the year 2014 by an Office Memorandum No A.III/CGHS/C/Emp.of Hospt/14-15/2008 dt. 17.11.2014, M/o Health and Family Welfare, Office of the Additional Director, Central Government Health Scheme. He would categorically assert that there was no revision of rates in-between and therefore the question of applying alleged 2012 rates for the treatment taken by the applicant's wife would not arise.

5. On perusal, it is seen that the applicant has not annexed any order issued between 2010 and 2014 revising the rates for the type of treatment undergone by the applicant's wife. As the applicant appears to have been paid his claims in accordance with CGHS rates prevailing at the relevant time and the respondents have categorically stated that there is no revision of rates between 2010 and 2014, the OA appears to be misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.