ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, CHENNAI

O.A. No. 03 of 2014

Tuesday, the 9th day of September 2014

THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE V. PERIYA KARUPPIAH
(MEMBER - JUDICIAL)
AND
THE HONOURABLE LT GEN K. SURENDRA NATH
(MEMBER – ADMINISTRATIVE)

Smt. Pachammal
W/o Late Sapper, Ser.No.1336055
Name-Venkataraman
Aged about 66 years
Village-Chinna Mottur
Post-Kanakamutlu
Taluk & District-Krishnagiri (T.N.)
Pin-635 002. ...Applicant

By Legal Practitioners:
M/s. M.K. Sikdar & S.Biju

vs.

1. Union of India
rep. by The Secretary
Government of India
Ministry of Defence
New Delhi-110 011.

2. The Officer-in-Charge
Abhilekh Karyalaya
Record Office, The Madras Engineer Group
Pin-900 493, C/o 56 APO

3. The PCDA (P)
G-3 Section, Draupadi Ghat
Allahabad (UP), Pin-211 014. ...Respondents

By Mr. B.Shanthakumar, SPC
assisted by Major Suchithra Chellappan
JAG Officer (Army)

ORDER

[(Order of the Tribunal made by
Hon'ble Justice V. Periya Karuppiah, Member (Judicial)]

1. This application is filed by the applicant praying for the grant of family pension with effect from 14.01.2012, i.e., the date of death of her husband Sapper, Ser.No.1336055, Venkataraman and for consequential monetary benefits with interest by directing the respondents to publish the name of the applicant in Part-II order and after quashment of the impugned order No.1336055/CF/NE-3, dated 23.10.2012 passed by the second respondent and for costs.

2. The applicant's husband Late Sapper Ser.No.1336055, Venkataraman was enrolled in Indian Army on 19.03.1963 and he was discharged from Indian Army on 31.03.1981 after serving for a period of 18 years and 13 days. The applicant's husband was drawing pro rata Army Pension through PPO No.S/C/15315/81. The applicant's husband originally married one Krishnammal in the year 1962 according to Hindu rites and customs prevailed in the community of Mal Karadiguri Village, Krishnagiri Taluk & District. The applicant's husband was not leading a happy marital life with the said Krishnammal and there were no children begotten in their wedlock. The said Krishnammal deserted the applicant's husband and a panchayat was convened and consequently customary divorce took place in between the applicant's husband and the

said Krishnammal in the year 1963. Thereafter, the applicant's husband married the applicant on 15.03.1968 as per Hindu rites and they were blessed with six children out of the wedlock. The claim of the applicant's husband for endorsing the applicant's name as wife in the Part-II order on the basis of the customary divorce between the applicant's husband and his first wife Krishnammal was not accepted by the respondents. Instead, the applicant's husband was advised to produce decree of divorce of his marriage with Krishnammal from a competent Court. Therefore, the name of the first wife Krishnammal was continued in Part-II order, as wife of the applicant's husband. The applicant's husband accordingly filed a divorce application in M.O.P.No.24 of 1996 before the Sub-Court, Krishnagiri and a decree of dissolution of the marriage between the applicant's husband and his first wife Krishnammal was passed on 08.08.1996. In the said order, the customary divorce that took place between the applicant's husband and his first wife Krishnammal had been recognized. On the basis of said decree of divorce, the applicant's husband approached the second respondent for endorsing the applicant's name in Part-II order as wife for family pension. The said representation was returned with a direction to re-submit the same with an affidavit sworn before a First Class Magistrate. On re-submission of the said application with the required affidavit on 22.05.1998, the second respondent did not publish Part-II

order endorsing the name of the applicant, but it was returned once again for re-submission through the Zila Sainik Welfare Officer for further action. On re-submission through Zila Sainik Welfare Officer, the second respondent did not act. Several representations made by the applicant's husband were of no use and the said representations were again returned on 18.6.2002. The Review Application filed by the applicant's husband was of no use. The further representation of the applicant's husband on 20.08.2008 for endorsing the applicant's name in the Part-II order was also not fruitful. Thus the applicant's husband did not get any relief, but was made to run from pillar to post for more than 20 years and finally he died on 14.01.2012. After her husband's demise, the applicant has no means to earn for her livelihood and now she is living only at the mercy of her children. The applicant after the death of her husband requested the second respondent for the grant of family pension in her letter dated 31.01.2012 and it was advised by the second respondent in their letter dated 29.02.2012 to send the same through Zila Sainik Welfare Officer for further action. The said direction was complied by the applicant on 09.03.2012. Another representation was made by the applicant on 12.04.2012 for the grant of family pension. The second respondent returned the said representation with a new observation as to the plural marriage and advised her to re-submit the representation through Zila Sainik Welfare Officer by its letter dated

18.06.2012. Accordingly, the applicant represented on 26.06.2012 through Zila Sainik Welfare Officer and yet the second respondent did not publish the Part-II order endorsing the applicant's name for family pension. The applicant is not in good health and she is aged 66 years and is unable to pull on with the huge medical expenditure. The non-grant of family pension to the applicant on the part of the second respondent is biased and with malafide intention to deprive the applicant from drawing the family pension. Therefore, the respondents may be directed to grant family pension from the date of death of her husband Venkataraman on 14.01.2012 and to grant consequential benefits accrued thereon along with interest after setting aside the impugned order passed by the second respondent in this regard. The application may thus be allowed.

3. The objections of the respondents would be that Late Sapper No.1336055, Venkataraman was enrolled in the army on 19.03.1963 and was transferred to Pension Establishment with effect from 01.04.1981 under Rule 13(3) Item III (i) of Army Rules 1954 on fulfilling the terms and conditions of his enrollment. He was granted with service pension with effect from 01.04.1981 for life vide Pension Payment Order No.S/C/15315/81. The said Ex Sapper Venkataraman nominated his father Mr.Dhakkan as Next of Kin and thereafter, he changed it to Smt. Krishnammal, his wife. The records available with the respondents

show that the said Venkataraman got married to Smt. Krishnammal in the year 1962. The children of Venkataraman, viz., Sakunthala, Kala and Arumugam were recorded as their children born on 26.02.1971, 21.11.1974 and 12.10.1977 respectively. The second respondent received a representation from the said Venkataraman for change of endorsement in Part II Order to which it was replied on 06.04.1998 with an advice to produce the decree of divorce from his first wife, an affidavit sworn before a First Class Magistrate and a Marriage Certificate obtained from the Registrar of Marriages or an affidavit sworn in before a First Class Magistrate to that effect with date of birth of wife. On submission of such papers and on careful scrutiny, it revealed that the individual had contracted plural marriage with the applicant on 15.03.1968 during the life-time of his first wife Smt. Krishnammal without obtaining divorce from her before a competent Court of Law. The second marriage between the applicant and Venkataraman was null and void and was amounting to plural marriage as per Hindu Marriage Act. It is also punishable under Indian Penal Code. The applicant being the second wife of Venkataraman is not entitled for family pension from the date death of Venkataraman on 14.01.2012. However, the children born out of such marriage are eligible for grant and share of family pension till they attain the age of 25 years within the framework of rules. The female children are eligible for family pension till their marriage or during

their unemployment or at their widowhood. The second respondent on 06.04.1998 had asked for the production of documents regarding divorce and re-marriage of Venkataraman with the applicant, but no documents were produced by Late Mr. Venkataraman. Both the applicant and Late Venkataraman failed to submit requisite documents in support of their claim and therefore, no further action could be taken by the respondents. The affidavit produced by the deceased Venkataraman would disclose that he married the applicant for the second time without divorcing his first wife Krishnammal and such marriage would tantamount to a plural marriage. In order to make changes in the military records, the certificates as asked for by the respondents are absolutely necessary. The Ex-Sapper Venkataraman and the applicant failed to submit the requisite documents in support of their claim. Therefore, the plea for publishing the name of the applicant in Part-II order as second wife for pension is not tenable. Accordingly, the application may be dismissed.

4. On the above pleadings, the following points were framed for consideration in the application.

> *(1) Whether the applicant's name has to be endorsed as the wife of Late Venkataraman, being his NoK in Part-II order towards the grant of family pension?*

(2) Whether the impugned order dated 23.10.2012 passed by the second respondent and the earlier similar orders passed by the respondents are liable to be set aside?

(3) To what reliefs, the applicant is entitled for?

5. Heard Mr. M.K. Sikdar, learned counsel for the applicant and Major Suchithra Chellappan, learned JAG Officer representing the respondents. We have also perused the connected records and documents as well as the written arguments submitted on either side.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant would submit in his argument that this unfortunate widow of Late Sapper Venkataraman has to approach this Tribunal for endorsement of her name in Part-II order and for publication of the same as the Next of Kin of Venkataraman towards the grant of family pension since the respondents did not lawfully act on her various representations. He would further submit that the marriage between Krishnammal and the applicant's husband Venkataraman in the year 1962 was customarily divorced in the year 1963 and the applicant married Late Sapper Venkataraman on 15.03.1968 according to Hindu Vedic rites and customs at Mal Karadiguri Village, Krishnagiri Taluk and they lived together till the death of her husband on 14.01.2012 and they got six children out of their wedlock and it would show the continuous cohabitation as husband and wife under one roof. He would further submit that the said customary divorce was recognized in a decree of

divorce passed by Sub-Court, Krishnagiri in M.O.P.No.24 of 1996 dated 08.08.1996 and therefore, the marriage between the applicant and her husband Venkataraman should not be termed as plural marriage. He would further submit that the customary divorce is permissible in law as per the provisions of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. He would further submit that the long cohabitation of the applicant with Late Sapper Venkataraman from 1968 onwards would go a long way to show that their marriage could be presumed as lawful, especially from the date of her marriage, and if not, immediately after the decree of divorce passed by a competent Court recognizing the validity of customary divorce between the applicant's husband and his first wife. He would submit that the first wife Krishnammal also died even prior to the death of the applicant's husband, and, six children born out of the marriage between the applicant's husband Late Venkataraman would show that the applicant was living as wife with Late Sapper Venkataraman under one roof throughout from the year 1968, i.e., from the date of marriage, till the death of Late Sapper Venkataraman on 14.01.2012. He would cite a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex court in a case between **S.P.S. Balasubramanyam** and **Suruttayan** reported in **AIR 1992 SC 756** in support of his argument. He would quote yet another judgment of Hon'ble Apex court in a case between **Challamma** and **Tilaga** reported in **2009 (9) SCC 299** for the principle that presumption of marriage

under Section 114 of the Evidence Act could be drawn on the natural common course of events and conduct of parties in the circumstances of a particular case to presume a man and a woman as husband and wife in favour of their wedlock. He would insist in his argument that the said similar circumstances also prevailed in this case so as to draw such presumption as dictated in yet another judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **2008 (4) SCC 520** between **Tulsa & Ors and Durghatiya & Ors**. He would also cite a judgment of this Tribunal made in a case between **M. Athi Lakshmi @ Sumathi** and **The Adjutant General and Ors.,** in **O.A.No.69 of 2013, dated 6.11.2013** passed in similar circumstances. He would also place his reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras reported in **2008 (5) CTC 294** in a case between **Sivasamy and & 2 Ors vs. Poomalai & 2 Ors.** in support of his case. Quoting the dicta laid down in the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the Hon'ble High Court and the order of this Tribunal, the learned counsel for the applicant would argue that the reasons put forth by the second respondent for holding the marriage between the applicant and her husband Sapper Venkataraman not sustained are not acceptable. He would also argue that the applicant's husband got divorce from his first wife Krishnammal even on 8th August 1996 reconfirming the customary divorce, however, this was not considered by the 2nd respondent. He would also draw our attention

that the non-grant of the claim made by the applicant's husband to endorse the name of his second wife (the applicant herein) in Part-II order on some pretext or other was really unfortunate and the entry of the applicant's name in Part-II order should have been done even during the life-time of the applicant's husband, but it is yet to be granted in favour of the applicant. The unfortunate applicant has to knock the doors of the Tribunal as she is direly in need of family pension for her remaining part of life and the same may be ordered on the guidelines and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and this Tribunal with costs, imposed against the respondent for the negligence and laches in granting the relief.

7. Per contra, the learned JAG Officer would submit in her written arguments that the applicant had admitted in her application itself that she was the second wife of Late Sapper Venkataraman and was married to Venkataraman on 15.03.1968 during the subsistence of the marriage of Venkataraman with Smt. Krishnammal. In view of the fact that the marriage of the applicant with Venkataraman was performed without obtaining any decree of divorce from a competent Court, the said marriage would be a null and void in the eye of law, as per the provisions of Hindu Marriage Act 1955. The subsequent decree of divorce obtained by Late Sapper Venkataraman would not make the marriage between the applicant and the Late Sapper Venkataraman a

valid one and therefore, the applicant could not be considered as the wife of Late Venkataraman and the request of the applicant for endorsement of her name in Part-II order towards the grant of family pension cannot be done. The various requests made by the said Late Sapper Venkataraman were returned for production of valid marriage certificate relating to the applicant which was not produced and therefore, the request was rejected. She would also submit that plural marriage is permitted as per Regulation 333 of Regulations for the Army for certain disabilities of the wife as envisaged therein, but in this case no such disability has been pleaded in order to prove that the marriage of the applicant with Late Sapper Venkataraman a was permissible one. She would also submit that the case laws put forth by the applicant are not applicable to the present case. Therefore, she would request this Tribunal to dismiss the application being devoid of merit.

8. We have given our anxious thoughts to the arguments advanced on either side.

9. **Point Nos. 1 and 2:** The indisputable facts in this case would be that the applicant was married to Late Sapper Venkataraman on 15.03.1968 as second wife. The said Late Sapper Venkataraman married Krishnammal as his first wife in the year 1962 and her name was entered in Part-II order by the said Venkataraman and it was not changed to the name of the applicant even subsequent to the marriage

of the applicant with Sapper Venkataraman till he was discharged from Army. The said Sapper Venkataraman was discharged from service on 31.03.1981 on completion of his service and was drawing service pension as per PPO No.S/C/15315/81 with effect from 01.04.1981. The fact that the said Venkataraman divorced his wife Krishnammal by obtaining a decree of divorce from the Sub-Court, Krishnagiri in M.O.P.No.24 of 1996, dated 08.08.1996 was also not disputed by the respondents.

10. The serious contention raised by the respondents would be that the marriage between the applicant and the Late Sapper Venkataraman was not proved by producing any document and even if it is proved, it is not a valid marriage since it took place during the subsistence of his marriage with first wife Krishnammal and no steps were taken by the Late Sapper Venkataraman to report the marriage with applicant and sought for the change of nomination in Part-II order during his service. No doubt Late Sapper Venkataraman did not disclose the marriage taken place between himself and the applicant during his tenure of service. He had raised his voice only after his discharge from the army for the change of nomination by endorsing the name of the applicant in Part-II order. A divorce application was filed by him before Sub-Court, Krishanagiri against his wife Krishnammal and the same was allowed on 08.08.1996 dissolving the marriage between Late Venkataraman with

Krishnammal. The said divorce decree would prove that the marriage between Krishnammal and Late Sapper Venkataraman was dissolved by an order of Court dated 08.08.1996. Whether such divorce order would make the applicant entitled for endorsing her name as wife of Late Sapper Venkataraman in Part-II order is the question. Furthermore, the applicant pleaded that the first wife Krishnammal died on 04.11.2009 and in order to prove it a death certificate of Krishnammal, viz., Annexure-18 has been produced. It has been argued that the applicant cohabited with Sapper Venkataraman from the date of her marriage in the year 1968 onwards and a divorce decree was granted against the first wife Krishnammal in favour of her husband and she continued her cohabitation with him even thereafter till her husband Late Sapper Venkataraman died on 14.01.2012. The argument advanced by the learned counsel for applicant is that the long cohabitation of the applicant with Late Sapper Venkataraman could easily be proved by the birth of their six children intermittantly from 1971 onwards. The last child born to late Sapper Venkataraman and the applicant, viz., Aravalli was on 13.10.1983. No doubt the birth of children would certainly prove the long continuous cohabitation of the applicant as wife till the death of Late Sapper Venkataraman. The repeated requisition of Late Sapper Venkataraman during his life time for endorsing the name of the applicant in Part-II order, would also go to show that the applicant was

living with Late Sapper Venkataraman throughout, till his death on 14.01.2012. Whether the argument of the learned counsel for applicant that long cohabitation of the applicant with Late Sapper Venkataraman would give rise to a presumption of legal status as to wife in favour of the applicant and could she be considered as the widow of Late Sapper Venkataraman after his death, should be answered.

11. In a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **AIR 1992 SC 756** between **S.P.S. Balasubramanyam v. Suruttayan**, it has been held as follows:

> *" The appellate court however, held to the contrary. It held that since Chinnathambi and Pavayee No.2 continuously lived under the same roof and cohabited for a number of years the law would raise presumption that they lived as husband and wife. There was no other evidence to destroy that presumption. So stating plaintiff's suit was decreed. In the second appeal the High Court took a different view. It was held that presumption available in favour of Pavayee No.2 by her continuous living with Chinnathambi has been destroyed by other circumstances in the case. The High Court relied upon three circumstances to rebut the presumption, (i) non-mentioning the name of Pavayee No.2 in the will Ex.B-1: (ii) not referring the names of Pavayee No.2 and her children by Chinnathambi in the compromise Ex.B-32; and (iii) the evidence of PW 6 and DW 4. We do not think that the circumstances relied upon by the High Court are relevant to*

destroy the presumption which is otherwise available to recognize Pavayee No.2 as the wife of Chinnathambi. The first two circumstances relied upon by the High Court are indeed neutral. The absence of any reference to Pavayee No.2 in Ex.B-1 or in Ex.B-32 cannot be held against the legitimacy of the children of Pavayee No.2 born to Chinnathambi. Equally, we do not find anything from the evidence of PW 6 or DW 4. Both these witnesses did not deny that Chinnathambi and Pavayee No.2 were living together. It is not in dispute that children including Ramaswamy were born to Chinnathambi. In our opinion, the circumstances and the evidence relied upon by the High Court are not relevant to destroy the presumption that Chinnathambi and Pavayee No.2 lived together as husband and wife. "

12. In yet another judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court cited by the learned counsel for the applicant reported in **(2008) 4 SCC 520** between **Tulsa & Ors.** and **Durghatiya & Ors.,** it has been laid down as follows:

"Section 114 of the Evidence Act refers to common course of natural events, human conduct and private business. The court may presume the existence of any fact which it thinks likely to have occurred. Reading the provisions of Sections 50 and 114 of the Evidence Act together, it is clear that the act of marriage can be

presumed from the common course of natural events and the conduct of parties as they are borne out by the facts of a particular case. Where the partners lived together for long spell as husband and wife there would be presumption in favour of wedlock. The presumption was rebuttable, but a heavy burden lies on the person who seeks to deprive the relationship of legal origin to prove that no marriage took place. Law leans in favour of legitimacy and frowns upon bastardy."

13. In yet another judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in (2009) 9 SCC 299 in the case of **Challamma vs. Tilaga,** it has been laid down as follows:

" 12. It is also well-settled that a presumption of a valid marriage although is a rebuttable one, it is for the other party to establish the same. (See Ranganath Parmeshwar Panditrao Moli v. Eknath Gajanan Kulkarni and Sobha Hymavathi Devi v. Setti Gangadhara Swamy). Such a presumption can be validly raised having regard to Section 50 of the Evidence Act. (See Tulsa). A heavy burden, thus, lies on the person who seeks to prove that no marriage has taken place. "

14. The principles laid down by the aforesaid judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court would categorically guide us to presume a lawful marriage on a long cohabitation of a man and woman living as husband and wife where their marriage has not been proved by other circumstances.

15. The said principle has been followed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in a Judgement reported in **2008 (5) CTC 294** in between **Sivasamy and 2 others Vs. Poomalai and 2 others**. The relevant passage would be as follows :-

> *"**16.**……. In the Judgment of the Division Bench referred to above, wherein Paragraph-22 has been extracted, it was held that even if the association had commenced during the life time of the first wife, but the relationship continued after the death of the first wife for long number of years and the second wife had borne children, then the presumption of marriage can definitely be taken. Here in this case, even if the marriage of the fifth defendant with Masi Ambalam was in 1946 during the lifetime of the plaintiff's mother, it continued after the first wife's death till Masi Ambalam died in 1987. All gender based discriminations, all practices which affect the dignity of women are contrary to the Constitution & Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The status of a woman who claims she is the wife and had lived as such for 40 years cannot be reduced to a mere "association" at the instance of the plaintiff merely because she wants the property especially when the world had labelled the fifth defendant as the wife of Masi Ambalam. To deny her status would rob her of the dignity to which she is entitled to."*
>
> (Emphasis supplied by us)

16. The said principle laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras would be squarely applicable to the present case as the applicant lived in cohabitation with Sapper Venkataraman under one roof even during the life time of the first wife Krishnammal and even after her death in the year 2009, the applicant continued to live with Late Sapper

Venkataraman as wife till his death on 14.01.2012. It is pertinent to note that the first wife Krishnammal was validly divorced by Late Sapper Venkataraman through a competent Court, viz., Sub-Court, Krishnagiri and obtained an order in M.O.P.No.24 of 1996 dated 08.08.1996. The said document produced would amply prove that the applicant was married to Late Sapper Venkataraman on 15.03.1968 as second wife and was living from the said date onwards during the subsistence of marriage of Late Venkataraman with Krishnammal. All these facts would go a long way to show that the applicant lived with Late Sapper Venkataraman from the year 1968 till the date of his death as wife and begot six children out of the relationship. In such circumstances, the long cohabitation of the applicant with the Late Sapper Venkataraman could be presumed to be a lawful marriage as they were living as husband and wife and the applicant be treated as legally wedded wife of the applicant atleast after the decree of divorce dated 08.08.1996. Therefore, the denial of the status of widow in favour of the applicant for the grant of family pension cannot be justified. The refusal on the part of the respondents to grant family pension in favour of to the applicant would certainly amount to denial of justice.

17. The grant of pension or family pension is an accrued right and it cannot be considered as a bounty or charity. Such principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court is very much clear. The denial of family

pension to the applicant by the respondents would amount to denial of her right to the benefits conferred upon the next of kin of the pensioner, viz., Late Sapper Venkataraman. Therefore, the claim of the applicant for the grant of family pension is necessarily to be accepted by the respondents. But it was not done so by the respondents. The applicant's husband, viz., Late Sapper Venkataraman was driven from pillar to post by consecutively returning his applications by the respondents for various obvious reasons. The orders passed by the second respondent for returning of the applications on flimsy reasons and the delay in ordering endorsement of the name of the applicant by quoting the reason of plural marriage was certainly not in accordance to the principles laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the second respondent and the earlier communications refusing the claim of the applicant are liable to be set aside and the applicant is entitled for her name being endorsed in Part-II order in the records of Late Sapper Venkataraman towards the grant of family pension. Accordingly, both the points are decided in favour of the applicant.

18. **Point No.3:** In the earlier points, we have discussed and decided that the applicant is entitled for family pension and the impugned orders passed by the respondents are liable to be set aside. The applicant's husband Sapper Venkataraman died on 14.01.2012 which is within three

years from the date of filing of this application. Therefore, the applicant is entitled for the grant of family pension from the date of death of her husband Venkataraman, i.e., with effect from 14.01.2012. Accordingly, this point is decided in favour of the applicant.

19. In fine, the application filed by the applicant seeking for the claim of grant of family pension with effect from 14.01.2012 is ordered as prayed for. The applicant is also eligible for all consequential benefits such as widow of an Ex-Serviceman including canteen facilities, ECHS etc. This order shall be complied with, within three months from the date of receipt of this order. In default, an interest of 9% per annum is payable from that date. No order as to costs.

Sd/
LT GEN K. SURENDRA NATH
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

Sd/
JUSTICE V.PERIYA KARUPPIAH
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

09.09.2014
(TRUE COPY)

Member (J) – Index : Yes/No Internet : Yes/No

Member (A) – Index : Yes/No Internet : Yes/No

vs

To:

1. The Secretary
Government of India
Ministry of Defence
New Delhi-110 011.

2. The Officer-in-Charge
Abhilekh Karyalaya
Record Office, The Madras Engineer Group
Pin-900 493, C/o 56 APO

3. The PCDA (P)
G-3 Section, Draupadi Ghat
Allahabad (UP), Pin-211 014.

4. M/s. M.K. Sikdar & S.Biju
Counsel for applicant

5. Mr. B.Shanthakumar, SPC
For respondents.

6. OIC, Legal Cell, ATNK & K Area, Chennai.

7. Library, AFT/RBC

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V. PERIYA KARUPPIAH
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
AND
HON'BLE LT GEN K. SURENDRA NATH
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

O.A.No.03 of 2014

Dt: 09.09.2014