

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH
HYDERABAD**

OA/020/536/2019

Dated: 19/06/2019

Between

S. Radha Krishna,
S/o. Late S.V.N. Sarma,
Aged 65 years, Retd. Office Supdt.,
Dy.CSTE/CN/S & T/BZA S.C. Railway,
Vijayawada, Krishna District.

... Applicant
AND

1. Union of India rep. by its
Divisional Railway Manager,
S.C. Railway,
Vijayawada.
2. The Senior Divisional Signal and
Telecom Engineer (Maintenance),
S.C. Railway,
Vijayawada.
3. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
S.C. Railway,
Vijayawada.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. J.M. Naidu

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N. Srinatha Rao, SC for Rlys.

CORAM :

***Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admin. Member***

ORAL ORDER

(Per Hon~~oble~~ Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman)

The applicant retired from service on 30.06.2014. His increment was due on 01.07.2014. The respondents did not take the increment into consideration, in the context of determining his retirement benefits. This O.A. is filed with a prayer to direct the respondents to take the increment which fell due on 01.07.2014 into account, and fix the retirement benefits. Reliance is placed upon the judgement dated 15.09.2017 of the Madras High Court in W.P. No.15732/2017.

2. We heard Sri J.M. Naidu, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N. Srinatha Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

3. It is, no doubt, true that the Madras High Court took the view that in case the increment of an employee becomes due one day after his retirement, it shall be taken into account, for the purpose of determining the retirement benefits. Same view was taken by a Division Bench of Andhra Pradesh High Court (to which, one of us ó Chairman, is a party).

4. However, at a later point of time, a Full Bench of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in *Principal Accountant General & Others v. C. Subba Rao & Others* [2005 (2) ALD 1= 2005 (2) ALT 25], took the view that, once an employee retires from service on the last day of a month, the question of his being extended the benefit of the increment, which fell due one day after his

retirement, does not arise. Hence, we do not find any merit in the O.A. and it is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

(JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN

pv