

0#

C.A.No. 1034 OF 1999

.....L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....
.PL55

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.1034 OF 1999@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

UOI & Ors. .. Appellants

Vs.

K. Visalakshy .. Respondent

WITH

C.A.No.7069/2000, C.A.No.1927/1999, C.A. No.504/2001

O_R_D_E_R@@
AAAAAAAAA

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....
.SP2

C.A. No.1034/1999@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

The question raised in this appeal is whether dependents of an employee entitled to the family pension admissible under one scheme available in one establishment are also entitled to such pension in another scheme in a different establishment. The High Court stated that such family pension is admissible under both the schemes. That view of the High Court is consistent with the stand of the Government itself in view of the amendment to the Rules made in the Central Civil Services(Pension) Amendment Rules, 2001. Therefore, we find no reason to interfere with the order made by the High Court. The appeal stands dismissed.

..2/-

-2-

C.A. Nos. 7069/2000,C.A.No.1927/1999,C.A.No.504/2001@@
CC

The questions raised in these appeals are identical to that raised in C.A. No. 1034/1999. Following the said decision and for the reasons stated therein, these appeals are also dismissed.

.SP1

.....J@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
[S. RAJENDRA BABU]@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

.....J@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
[P.VENKATARAMA REDDI]@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

New Delhi,@@
AAAAAAAAAAAA
February 26, 2002.

.PA
.PL60
.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....
ITEM NO.111 COURT NO. 5 SECTION-XIA

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO.1034/1999

UOI & Ors. .. Appellants

Vs.

K. Visalakshy .. Respondent

With

C.A. No.7069/2000,C.A.No.1927/1999,C.A.No.504/2001

DATE : 26.2.2002 : This/These matter (s) was/were
called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAJENDRA BABU
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. VENKATARAMA REDDI

For Appellant (s) : Mr. M.N. Krishnamani, Sr. Adv.
Mr. R.C. Verma, Adv.
Mr. S. Pani, Adv.
Ms. Neeta Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv.
Mr. B.V. Balram Das, Adv.

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent (s) : Mrs. K. Sarada Devi, Adv.

Mr. G. Prakash, Adv.

Mr. V.N. Raghupathy, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

.....L.....I.....J
.SP2

Mr. M.N. Krishnamani, learned senior advocate
started his arguments at 3.00 p.m. and concluded at 3.30
p.m.

Appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

.SP1

(Meenu Sethi)
Court Master

(Om Prakash)
Court Master

Signed order is placed on the file