

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 434 OF 2012**

Union of India & Anr.	..	Petitioners
versus		
Shri Hemadri S. Pol	..	Respondent

None for Petitioners.

Mr. S. Pilankar i/b. Mr. Uday Warunjikar for Respondent.

**CORAM: V. M. KANADE AND
M. S. SONAK, JJ.**

DATE : 26 JULY 2016

P.C.:

1] None appears on behalf of the petitioners. Heard Mr. Pilankar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent.

2] The respondent had filed original application before the Central Administrative Tribunal seeking payment of pro-rata pension for the services rendered by the respondent between 7 July 1947 and 27 December 1962. After taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent, the CAT gave a direction to the petitioners to consider the case of the respondent / applicant for grant of pro-rata pension according to rules and to pay the same to the respondent / applicant along with the arrears.

3] It is obvious that the only direction which was given by the Tribunal to the petitioners to consider the claim of the respondent.

Instead of doing that, the said order has been challenged. We do not see any reason to interfere with the said order. The petitioner to consider and take the decision in accordance with rules within six weeks and immediately inform the respondent.

4] Petition is disposed of.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)

(V. M. KANADE, J.)

chandka