

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD**

**OA/020/103/2019**

**Dated: 15/11/2019**

Between

P. Ujjinaiah, Gr-C,  
S/o. P. Chinna Mallesappa,  
Aged 70 years,  
Occ: Retd Postman,  
Georgepet S.O.,  
Anantapur Division, A.P.

... Applicant

AND

1. Union of India rep. by  
Secretary, Govt. of India,  
Ministry of Communications and I.T.,  
Department of Posts,  
New Delhi ó 110 001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,  
A.P. Circle,  
Vijayawada ó 10.
3. Post Master General,  
Kurnool Region,  
Kurnool ó 518 002.
4. The Director Postal Accounts,  
AP TG Circles,  
Hyderabad ó 500 001.
5. The Superintendent,  
Anantapur Division,  
Anantapur ó 515 001.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. B. Gurudas

Counsel for the Respondents : Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC

**CORAM :**

***Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member***

**ORAL ORDER**

(Per Honøble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member)

This O.A. has been filed challenging the decision of the respondents in sanctioning retirement benefits of the applicant without taking into account the enhanced Dearness Allowance of 4%, which was allowed w.e.f. 1.07.2008.

3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicant retired from the respondents organization on 30.06.2008. Retirement benefits were disbursed to the applicant without taking into account the 4

% Dearness Allowance (in short, DA) granted w.e.f. 01.07.2008. Applicant represented on 14.11.2018 with a request to consider enhanced DA in working out the retirement benefits. The same has not been responded to till date. Hence, the OA.

4. Contentions of the applicant are that he has retired on 30.06.2015, and would cease to be a Govt. servant on the midnight of the date of retirement. Applicant is eligible for higher DA by virtue of rendering service for 6 months preceding the retirement date from 01.01.2008 to 30.06.2008. Based on the enhanced DA, retirement benefits are to be calculated. By not allowing enhanced DA, the decision of the respondents is illegal and irregular. Applicant cited that this Tribunal in OA 252/2015 dated 18.11.2015

has allowed similar relief based on the Full Bench Judgement of the Honøble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana State in **Principal Accountant General, AP v. C. Subba Rao** (Writ Petition No.22042/2003).

6. Respondents in their reply statement have opposed the contention of the applicant by stating that as per Department of Pension and Pensioners Welfare, OM dated 02.09.2008, the relevant para(s) of which are extracted hereunder, applicant is not eligible for enhanced DA:

ö4.1 The term -Emolumentsö for purposes of calculating various Pensionary benefits other than various kinds of Gratuity shall have the same meaning as in Rule 33 of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972.

4.2. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

4.3 In the case of all kinds of Gratuity, DA admissible on the date of retirement shall continue to be treated as emoluments along with the emoluments as defined in paragraph 4.1 above.ö

Having retired from service, the applicant is entitled for DR, which has been allowed and permitted under the rules. Accordingly, applicant has been granted Dearness Relief due to him. The respondents have stated that they have filed Writ Petition Nos.35139/2017 and 35126 of 2017 in the Honøble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana State against the impugned orders dated 11.03.2016 of this Tribunal in OA No.189/2016 and 190/2016 respectively. In the said OA, the relief sought in the present OA, was granted. However, the Honøble High Court vide Order dated 24.10.2017 dismissed both the Writ Petitions, keeping in view the Full Bench Judgement of the Honøble High Court of AP and Telangana in Writ Petition Nos.22042, 24191, 24308 and 24324 of 2003. The matter was thereafter carried to Honøble Supreme Court in SLP No.5646 of 2018 and 5647 of 2018

respectively, against the orders of the Honøble High Court. The Honøble Supreme Court stayed the orders of the Honøble High Court in WP Nos.35126 of 2017 and 35139 of 2017 (dated 24.10.2017), vide its order dated 12.03.2018.

7. In view of the above developments, the respondents are directed to consider and grant relief sought in the instant OA based on the judgement of the Honøble Supreme Court in the cited SLPs, as and when it is delivered/decided finally.

With the above directions, the OA is disposed of with no order as to costs.

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

*pv*