

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: HYDERABAD**

Original Application No.20/1164/2018

Date of Order: 17.06.2019

Between:

Kunti Kullayamma, W/o. late Kunti Peddanna,
Age: 46 years, Occ: House wife, Gr. C,
R/o. Rudrampet, Ajay Ghosh Colony,
Anantapuram Rural, Anantapur District.

... Applicant

And

1. The Union of India, rep. by
The Secretary, Ministry of Information and
Broadcasting, Sastri Bhawan,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Station Director,
All India Radio Station,
Opp. Assembly, Saifabad,
Hyderabad.
3. The Deputy Station Director,
All India Radio Station,
Opp. Assembly, Saifabad,
Hyderabad.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant ... Mrs. S. Anuradha

Counsel for the Respondents ... Mr. Venkanna, Advocate, for
Mr. A. Radhakrishna,
Sr. PC for CG

CORAM:
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)

ORAL ORDER

{As per Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.) }

2. OA is filed against the action of the respondents in not releasing family pension and other retiral benefits.

3. Applicant's husband expired on 20.3.2018 while working as Farash in the respondents organisation. Respondents have not released the retiral benefits despite lapse of 6 months from the date of demise of the ex-employee. Representation was made on 17.4.2018 and there being no response, the OA is filed.

4. The contention of the applicant is that withholding the retiral benefits for months together is against the Principles of Natural Justice and illegal.

5. Respondents contend that the applicant sought voluntary retirement, which was accepted and he was relieved on 1.11.2017. Thereafter, the employee passed away and not while being in service. There was delay in submission of papers by the applicant. On receipt of the same, they were processed and sent to the competent authority to issue the PPO (Pension Payment Order).

6. Heard both the counsel and perused the material papers placed on record.

7. As can be seen from the records and the submissions made, there was delay in submitting the relevant papers by the applicant, to process and issue PPO. On the contrary, it was the respondents who pursued with the applicant to present the requisite documents. Hence, it is not fair to blame the respondents for the delay. Finally, the papers were processed and sent to the concerned for release of PPO. In view of the aforesaid

circumstances, respondents are directed to issue the PPO as per extant rules and regulations of the respondent organisation within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of this order. With the above direction the OA is disposed off with no order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Dated, the 17th day of June, 2019

evr