

W.P.C.T. 220 of 2024

**The Union of India & Ors.
Vs.
Sri Debjit Goswami**

Mr. Rabi Prosad Mookerjee,
Mr. Atanu Basu

...for the Petitioners

Mr. P.C. Das,
Mr. S.K. Ganguli

...for the Respondent

1. The brief facts forming the basis of the petitioners' claim before the Central Administrative Tribunal (*hereinafter referred to as C.A.T.*) are not in dispute. He was voluntarily retired from service on 10.01.2021 while he was holding the post of Senior Section Engineer in South Eastern Railway.
2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that he was handed over the acceptance of the V.R.S. on 09.01.2021 and N.O.C. was also issued to him on 25.01.2021. The entire amount of D.C.R.G., however, could be released only on 09.08.2021. It is submitted that award of interest by the C.A.T. in these circumstances is not sustainable.
3. The learned counsel for the respondent has also appeared. He submits that there is no allegation that the delay whatsoever was attributable to the applicant before the C.A.T. inasmuch as it is admitted case that N.O.C. was granted to the applicant on 25.01.2021. Considering the relevant

provisions of the CCS (Pension) Rules, namely, Rule 68(1) thereof the C.A.T. has directed for award of interest in accordance with the said provision for the delay of nearly seven to eight months in releasing the D.C.R.G. amount which requires no interference.

4. Upon consideration of the rival submissions, we find force in the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent. The order of the C.A.T. manifests due consideration of the rule provision, which contemplates grant of interest and the interest has been awarded at the rate specified in the rule, noted above.
5. The delay was not attributable to the applicant, and since the respondent/petitioner did not raise any other ground to substantiate the delay, we are of the opinion that petitioners cannot be made to suffer deprivation of interest which the amount/s would have earned if the same was received by the petitioners on time as per the Rule.
6. We find no reason to interfere with the award of interest.
7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)