

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).8314/2003

(From the judgement and order dated 31/10/2002 in CMWP No. 28770/2000 of The HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD)

RAJENDRA BAHADUR PARMARTHI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

(For final disposal)

Date: 19/10/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.G. BALAKRISHNAN

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.K. JAIN

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. S.B. Upadhyay, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Anita Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Dinesh Kumar Tiwari, Adv.

For Ms. Kumud Lata Das, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. T.S. Dhobia, Sr. Adv.

Mr. G. Prakash, Adv.

For Mrs Anil Katiyar, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Leave granted.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and counsel for
the respondents.

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

(R.K. DHAWAN)

(VEERA VERMA)

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.4583 OF 2006

(Arising out of SLP(C) No.8314/2003)

RAJENDRA BAHADUR PARMARTHI

.... APPELLANT.

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.... RESPONDENT

S.

O R D E R

Leave granted.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and counsel for the

respondent.

The appellant joined the Department of Small Scale Industry

on 6.5.1967 at the age of 32 years, and on 31.5.1993 he retired,

attaining the age of 58 years. The appellant sought the benefit of sub-

rule (1) of Rule 30 CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 which gives additional 5

years notional period of service under certain conditions. This benefit

was not extended to the appellant though he made an application on the

ground that these particular rules are not made applicable to the

Department in which he is working. The appellant contends that for

violation of principle of this policy, he submitted a representation to the

...2/-

-2-

Additional Secretary & Development Commissioner (SST) on 24th July,

1998. The appellant would be at liberty to make a further representation

to the Additional Secretary and Development Commissioner (SST) and

thereafter appropriate orders may be passed.

With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of accordingly.

.....J
(K.G. BALAKRISHNAN)

.....J
(D.K. JAIN)

NEW DELHI ;

OCTOBER 19, 2006.