Date of reserved for orders : 15.10.2026, 16.10.2026, 27.10.2026, 28.10.2026
Date of pronouncement : 02.11.2026
Date of uploading : 02.11.2026

APHC010547402026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3460]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE 2nd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 30012/2026

Between:

Darapureddy Venkata Rama Mohan **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30252/2026

Between:

Kalidindi Brahma Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30256/2026

Between:

Gadiraju Venkata Padma Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30261/2026

Between:

Vemulamanda Siva Rama Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30455/2026

Between:

Penmetsa Ramamurty Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30484/2026

Between:

Koppula Satyanarayana **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30508/2026

Between:

Vanapalli Durga Prasada Rao, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30587/2026

Between:

Vegesna Kasi Viswanadha Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30713/2026

Between:

Kopparty Venkata Ramana Murty **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. M UMA DEVI (CENTRAL GOVT COUNSEL)

WRIT PETITION NO: 30791/2026

Between:

Alluri Subrahmanyam Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30796/2026

Between:

Nadimipalli Venkata Subba Raju, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30821/2026

Between:

Kanumuri Bhaskar **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30827/2026

Between:

Kalidindi Ramaprasada Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30838/2026

Between:

Penmetsa Venkata Ramana Subrahmanya Padmaraju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30839/2026

Between:

Patchigolla Subba Rao **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30842/2026

Between:

Vegesna V S L Udaya Kumari **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30857/2026

Between:

Penmetsa Venkata Gopala Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 30903/2026

Between:

Vatsavai Rama Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30915/2026

Between:

Pedakota Kantarao **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30917/2026

Between:

Gannabathula Venkata Someswara Padma Rao **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30928/2026

Between:

Vasamsety Chandra Sekhar **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 30930/2026

Between:

Adavi Balakrishna **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 31014/2026

Between:

Gadiraju Nagaraju **...PETITIONER**

AND

The Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 31023/2026

Between:

Veerubhotla Vasudeva Murthy **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

WRIT PETITION NO: 31029/2026

Between:

Gadiraju Chatapathi Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. AKHIL KRISHNAN CENTRAL GOVT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31032/2026

Between:

Penmetsa Venkata Rama Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. AKHIL KRISHNAN CENTRAL GOVT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31046/2026

Between:

Penmetsa Appala Rama Krishna Raju, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. P PADMAVATHI (CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL)

WRIT PETITION NO: 31058/2026

Between:

Dantuluri Ranga Raju, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. P PADMAVATHI (CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL)

WRIT PETITION NO: 31075/2026

Between:

Srinivas Chitturi **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. W V B SHRAVAN(CENTRAL GOVT.COUNSEL)

WRIT PETITION NO: 31090/2026

Between:

Chintalapati Gopalaraju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. W V B SHRAVAN(CENTRAL GOVT.COUNSEL)

WRIT PETITION NO: 31095/2026

Between:

Karanam Suresh Babu **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31104/2026

Between:

Dandu Satyanarayana Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31127/2026

Between:

Chekuri Venkata Siva Rama Krishnam Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

The Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31149/2026

Between:

Bhupathiraju Venkata Satya Suryanarayana Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31168/2026

Between:

Kalidindi Venkata Krishnam Raju **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31188/2026

Between:

Kondareddy Anjireddy, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

WRIT PETITION NO: 31216/2026

Between:

Nagaila Venkateswara Rao, **...PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P VIVEK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ALA CHANDRASEKHAR YADAV CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL

The Court made the following:
Whether the order is :

Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No
Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION Nos.30012, 30252, 30256, 30261, 30455, 30484, 30508, 30587, 30713, 30791, 30796, 30821, 30827, 30838, 30839, 30842, 30857, 30903, 30915, 30917, 30928, 30930, 31014, 31023, 31029, 31032, 31046, 31058, 31075, 31090, 31095, 31104, 31127, 31149, 31168, 31188, 31216 of 2026

COMMON ORDER:

1. These Writ Petitions are filed questioning the Proceedings dated 06.02.2024 issued by Respondent No.4 rejecting the applications of the Petitioners for higher pension in the light of Paragraph 44(v) of the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Employees Provident Fund Organisation & anr Vs Sunil Kumar. B & Ors***[1] and Head Office Instructions, as illegal and arbitrary.

2. Heard Sri M. Srikanth, appearing for the Counsel for the Petitioners Sri P. Vivek and the learned Standing Counsel for Employees' Provident Fund Organisation Sri T. Balaji appearing for the Respondents.

3. As the reason for rejecting the applications of the Petitioners is similar in all these cases, with the consent of the respective counsels, a Common Order is being passed at the stage of admission.

---

[1] 2022 Livelaw (SC) 912

4. The Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995, was introduced pursuant to introduction of Section 6(A) to the Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952. Initially, the maximum pensionable salary under this scheme was Rs.5,000/- and this was enhanced subsequently to Rs.6,500/- pursuant to introduction of proviso to Paragraph 11(3) of the scheme.

5. The initial amendment, enhancing the maximum pensionable salary from Rs.5,000 to Rs.6,500, had provided a cut-off date of 6 months to be exercised by the employer and the employee for said benefit. This cut-off date was questioned by certain employees on the ground that they were not made aware of the said scheme and the benefit should not be deprived to them. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***R.C. Gupta and others Vs Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Employees Provident Fund Organisation and Others***[2] held that the cut-off date cannot be made applicable to a beneficial scheme.

6. Vide GSR No.609(E) dated 22.8.2014, amendments were again brought in to the scheme by the Union Government in exercise of power under Section 5 and Section 7(1) of the of the Employees Provident Fund

[2] 2018(14)SCC 809

and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952. As mentioned above, the maximum pensionable amount was enhanced to Rs.15,000/- from 01.09.2014 and the time frame for exercising option was six (6) months as per Paragraph 11(4) of the scheme. The said Paragraph also provided for a default clause to the effect that, if the option is not exercised within the time frame of six (6) months, it was deemed that the member has not opted for the contribution over the wage ceiling and the contributions to the pension fund made over the wage ceiling in respect of a member, shall be diverted to the Provident Fund account of the member along with interest as declared under the scheme from time to time. The amendments also provided for change in the manner of calculation of the pension payable.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Employees Provident Fund Organisation & anr Vs Sunil Kumar. B & Ors***[3] considered the validity of the amendments and had upheld the same in principle. As regards the time frame of six (6) months for exercising option to pay higher contribution, the interpretation of the Judgment in ***R.C. Gupta*** (2 supra) was followed insofar as employees in service as on 01.09.2014. Insofar as employees who retired by 01.09.2014 and exited the Scheme and did

[3] 2022 Livelaw (SC) 912

not exercise option under Paragraph 11(3) as it then was, the benefit of extended time of six (6) months was not made available for them. The directions in the Judgement was crystallised in Paragraph 44 thereof and the same reads as under;

> *"44. We accordingly hold and direct:-*
>
> *(i) The provisions contained in the notification no. G.S.R. 609(E) dated 22nd August 2014 are legal and valid. So far as present members of the fund are concerned, we have read down certain provisions of the scheme as applicable in their cases and we shall give our findings and directions on these provisions in the subsequent sub-paragraphs.*
>
> *(ii) Amendment to the pension scheme brought about by the notification no. G.S.R. 609(E) dated 22nd August 2014 shall apply to the employees of the exempted establishments in the same manner as the employees of the regular establishments. Transfer of funds from the exempted establishments shall be in the manner as we have already directed.*
>
> *(iii) The employees who had exercised option under the proviso to paragraph 11(3) of the 1995 scheme and continued to be in service as on 1st September 2014, will be guided by the amended provisions of paragraph 11(4) of the pension scheme.*
>
> ***(iv) The members of the scheme, who did not exercise option, as contemplated in the proviso to paragraph 11(3) of the pension scheme (as it was before the 2014***

Amendment) would be entitled to exercise option under paragraph 11(4) of the post amendment scheme. Their right to exercise option before 1st September 2014 stands crystalised in the judgment of this Court in the case of R.C. Gupta (supra). The scheme as it stood before 1st September 2014 did not provide for any cutoff date and thus those members shall be entitled to exercise option in terms of paragraph11(4) of the scheme, as it stands at present. Their exercise of option shall be in the nature of joint options covering pre-amended paragraph 11(3) as also the amended paragraph 11(4) of the pension scheme.

There was uncertainty as regards validity of the post amendment scheme, which was quashed by the aforesaid judgments of the three High Courts. Thus, all the employees who did not exercise option but were entitled to do so but could not due to the interpretation on cut-off date by the authorities, ought to be given a further chance to exercise their option. Time to exercise option under paragraph 11(4) of the scheme, under these circumstances, shall stand extended by a further period of four months. We are giving this direction in exercise of our jurisdiction under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. Rest of the requirements as per the amended provision shall be complied with.

(v) The employees who had retired prior to 1st September 2014 without exercising any option under paragraph 11(3) of the pre-amendment scheme have already exited from the membership thereof. They would not be entitled to the benefit of this judgment.

(vi) The employees who have retired before 1st September 2014 upon exercising option under paragraph 11(3) of the 1995 scheme shall be covered by the provisions of the paragraph 11(3) of the pension scheme as it stood prior to the amendment of 2014.

(vii) The requirement of the members to contribute at the rate of 1.16 per cent of their salary to the extent such salary exceeds Rs.15000/- per month as an additional contribution under the amended scheme is held to be ultra vires the provisions of the 1952 Act. But for the reasons already explained above, we suspend operation of this part of our order for a period of six months. We do so to enable the authorities to make adjustments in the scheme so that the additional contribution can be generated from some other legitimate source within the scope of the Act, which could include enhancing the rate of contribution of the employers. We are not speculating on what steps the authorities will take as it would be for the legislature or the framers of the scheme to make necessary amendment. For the aforesaid period of six months or till such time any amendment is made, whichever is earlier, the employees'

contribution shall be as stop gap measure. The said sum shall be adjustable on the basis of alteration to the scheme that may be made.

(viii) We do not find any flaw in altering the basis for computation of pensionable salary.

(ix) We agree with the view taken by the Division Bench in the case of R.C. Gupta (supra) so far as interpretation of the proviso to paragraph 11(3) (pre-amendment) pension scheme is concerned. The fund authorities shall implement the directives contained in the said judgment within a period of eight weeks, subject to our directions contained earlier in this paragraph.

(x) The Contempt Petition (C) Nos.1917-1918 of 2018 and Contempt Petition (C) Nos. 619-620 of 2019 in Civil Appeal Nos. 10013-10014 of 2016 are disposed of in the above terms."

8. Pursuant to the above Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the EPFO had issued a Joint Option Form to be exercised by the employee and employer in terms of Paragraph 44(iv) and (v) of the above Judgment i.e., by the employees, who are in service as on 01.09.2014. Accordingly, the Petitioners and their employer exercise Joint Option as provided.

9. However, the Joint Option was rejected vide the impugned order on the ground that the employer had not paid PF contributions on actual wages, but had paid only on statutory wages from November, 1999 till date and rejected the applications in terms of Paragraph 44(v) of the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sunil Kumar**'s case (1 supra).

10. The Joint Option Form was issued pursuant to the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the ***Sunil Kumar'***s case (1 supra) and a disclaimer is provided in the Joint Option Form to the effect that the persons registering agrees for the calculation of pension provided under the Amendment of 2014. The Clause 19 of the Joint Option Form seeks the option of the member whether he is giving undertaking to deposit contributions along with interest due till date of payment through the last employer when the PF account has insufficient balance. In the declaration provided in the Joint Option Form, an undertaking is to be given by the Member that he would agree to pay due contribution in a single tranche as specified by EPFO along with interest at rates declared under Paragraph 60 of Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 or at the rate declared by the concerned trust of such establishment from time to time whichever is higher if any. The Clause 7 of the declaration also states that opt to pay full amount of

contribution on salary exceeding wage ceiling under erstwhile Para 11(3) and Para 11(4) of Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 along with interest up to the last date of the month in which the payment is made in accordance with the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court within such period as may be directed by EPFO. The Clause 19 of the Option Form and Clauses 6 and 7 of the Declaration are extracted below;

"19	*Whether member is giving undertaking to deposit the contributions along with interest due till date of payment through his last 19 employer (only when PF account has no/ insufficient balance]?*	Yes

6. I hereby agree to pay due contribution in a single tranche as specified by EPFO, along with interest at rates declared under Para 60 of EPF Scheme 1952 or at the rate declared by the concerned trust of such establishment, from time to time, whichever is higher, if any.

7. I hereby jointly opt along with my employer to pay full amount of contribution on salary exceeding wage ceiling under erstwhile para 11(3) (since deleted) and para 11(4) of EPS 95 along with interest upto the last date of the month in which payment is made, in accordance with the judgement dated 04.11.2022 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court through my last employer within such period as may be directed by EPFO after verification of my joint option. If the full amount payable is not

deposited by my last employer within such period as may be directed by EPFO after verification of my joint option, this joint option shall be liable to be treated as Null and Void."

11. The Joint Option Form is an undertaking by the employer and employee to pay amounts over and above the wage ceiling specified in the scheme and the differential amount would be paid on being intimated by the authorities under EPFO in a single tranche with interest. However, contrary to the very purpose of Joint Option Form, the authorities passed impugned order on the ground that the amounts over the wage ceiling were not contributed. Secondly, the applications were rejected in terms of Paragraph 44(v) of the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court, which is with reference to employees who retired by 01.09.2014 and had exited the scheme by that date, which is not so in the present batch of cases as the petitioners continued in service beyond 01.09.2014. The cases of the Petitioners have to be examined in terms of Paragraph 44 (iv) of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, who continued in service beyond 01.09.2014 that is the date on which the amendment to the scheme came into effect.

12. For the aforesaid reasons, the Writ Petitions are disposed of with the following directions;

(i) The impugned orders rejecting the claim of the Petitioners for higher pension pursuant to exercise of Joint Option Form are set-aside.

(ii) The Respondents shall process the Joint Option Form in terms of Paragraph 44(iv) the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court ***Employees Provident Fund Organisation & anr v. Sunil Kumar. B & Ors (2022 Livelaw (SC) 912) a***nd shall intimate the Petitioners the differential amounts to be paid within a period of two (2) months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

(iii) No order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

NYAPATHY VIJAY, J

Date: 02.11.2026

IS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION Nos.30012, 30252, 30256, 30261, 30455, 30484, 30508, 30587, 30713, 30791, 30796, 30821, 30827, 30838, 30839, 30842, 30857, 30903, 30915, 30917, 30928, 30930, 31014, 31023, 31029, 31032, 31046, 31058, 31075, 31090, 31095, 31104, 31127, 31149, 31168, 31188, 31216 of 2026

Date: 02.11.2026

IS