

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

O.A/20/0046/2017

Date of order : 03.10.2018

Between:

Mr. R.LOKANATHAN,  
S/o Mr. A.RAMACHANDRAN,  
Occupation: Retd. Goods Guard,  
South Central Railway,  
Renigunta,  
R/o D.No.21,  
Theepath Amman Koil Street,  
Tiruttani,  
Tiruvallur District (TN).

Applicant

A N D

1. Union of India, ,  
Represented by General Manager,  
South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam,  
Secunderabad,
2. The Financial Advisor & Chief Accounts Officer,  
South Central Railway,  
Secunderabad,
3. The Chief Personnel Officer & Ex-officio Chairman,  
Pension Adalat,  
South Central Railway,  
Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad,
4. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Guntakal Division,  
Guntakal 515 801,  
Anantapur District (AP),
5. The Senior Divisional Finance Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Guntakal Division,  
Guntakal 515 801,  
Anantapur District (AP),
6. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,  
South Central Railway,  
Guntakal Division,  
Guntakal 515 801,  
Anantapur District (AP),

... Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : Mr. B.Sekhar Reddy  
Counsel for the respondents : Mr.M.Venkateswarlu  
C O R A M :

**THE HON'BLE MR .B V SUDHAKAR, MEMBER (A)**

**O R D E R**

The OA is filed praying to direct the respondents to revise and update the impugned order PPO NO.59062123597 dt. 30.11.2013 issued by FA&CEO/SCR/SC & Lr.NO.A/PEN/GTL/RLYS/23597 dt. 29.11.2013 of Sr.DCM/SCR/SC drawing and disbursing the basic pension and other allowances thereon and settlement benefits such as gratuity, commutation value of pension and leave salary including the component of running allowance as applicable for running staff such as guards and loco pilots.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the respondents.
3. During the course of arguments, it was informed by the learned standing counsel for the respondents that the learned proxy counsel for the applicant Mrs. Anuradha has informed him that applicant is satisfied by the contents of the reply statement filed by the respondents and hence she is not pressing the OA.
4. The OA is accordingly disposed of as infructuous. No order as to costs.

**(B V SUDHAKAR)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**Dated: 3rd OCTOBER, 2018**  
**Dictated in open court**

vsn