



Monthly Journal of
KARNATAKA POSTS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS
PENSIONERS' ASSOCIATION (R)

(KSR Act 1960, REG. No. 1069/98-99)
(FORMERLY RMS PENSIONERS' ASSOCIATION)

Registered as "a Wholly Charitable Trust" U/S. 12A of I.T. Act 1961

Regd. Office: # 1397, 23rd Main, Banashankari 2nd Stage, Bangalore-560 070. Phone: 26716198
Own Building: PENSIONERS' BHAVAN, 61/1, 1st Main, 11th Cross, Telecom Layout, Jakkur Cross,
Bangalore-560 064. Ph.: 23620545 e-mail: pensionersbhavan@gmail.com
Website : www.kptpa.org

B. Sadashiva Rao , IPS (Retd.) President, Ph.: 26626333 M: 99450-18275	N. Bhaskaran Secretary, Ph.: 26716198	S.M. Vittal Rao Treasurer, Ph.: 28463468
VOLUME XIV	ISSUE 5	MAY 2013
1) Annual Subscription For members- Rs. 100/-		Single Copy - Rs. 12/-
2) Annual Subscription For others - Rs.120/-		

Development of Vision Document for CGHS -2020

(Suggestions from CCCGPA, Karnataka, to Sri Umeshchandra S. Biradar, Addl. Director,
CGHS, Bangalore, conveyed in letter No.CCCGPA/CGHS/8 dated 6th May, 2013)

All issues connected with our suggestions involve allotment of additional funds by the Government. The policy of the Government over the years on healthcare leaves much to be desired. In comparison to other countries, the allocation of funds for healthcare in India is very meagre. It is getting reduced year after year. It was 7.02% of GDP in 1985-86. It had got reduced year after year and was 3.9% of GDP in 2010-11. Contrary to this situation, the percentages of allocation of funds in other countries had got increased year after year in terms of GDP. In the year 2010-11, they have got increased to the following percentages: China – 5.2, Nepal – 5.4, Russia – 6.2, Korea – 7.2, Australia – 9, Japan – 9.3, U.K.- 9.3 and U.S.A. – 17.9.

1. Better coverage of CGHS:

1.1. The coverage of CGHS in Metropolitan cities should get extended to newly developed areas

and hence periodical review for their inclusion is to be made. Depending upon the additional coverage of the area, provision should exist for opening more Wellness Centres. The existing discrimination of not extending CGHS facility to 'P&T pensioners not-participating in CGHS before retirement' needs to be removed. All pensioners governed by CCS (Pension) Rules 1972 should be extended CGHS facility. P&T Dispensaries should be taken over and converted into fully-equipped CGHS Wellness Centres. As suggested by V CPC in para 140.6 of its recommendation, the possibility of pooling medical facilities in various departments of the Central Government such as Railways (RELHS), Defence (ECHS) and some of the other C.G. establishments (CHS) should be explored. The possibility of utilization of medical facilities made available by the State Governments to their pensioners and vice-versa on reciprocal basis should also be explored. In each Metropolitan area, a CGHS hospital with

DONATIONS FOR BUILDING FUND		
Members who have donated Rs. 10,000 & above		
LM/ ALM	NAME	AMOUNT Rs.
662	SRIDHARAMURTHY .S	70,000
524	BHAGAWAN .K.N	51,000
4	SADASHIVA RAO .B	45,000
1279	JAYAKUMAR ANAGOL	45,000
362	RAJAGOPALAN .M.N	44,700
1166	BALIGA .B.R	35,000
505	DEVARAJ .G	33,000
3	RAMIAH .M	31,110
135	KRISHNAMURTHY .M.S	30,617
1597	VENKATASUBBAIAH .B.V	30,566
294	MUNINANJA REDDY	26,055
35	BHASKARAN .N	25,000
503	SHAMAPRIYA .N.R	25,000
600	NAGARAJA .V.N	25,000
24	KRISHNAN .S	24,000
1286	HANJI .M.M	23,001
826	PRABHAKARA .H.S	22,100
789	SADASHIVA RAO .V	22,000
232	ACHYUTHA RAO .S	21,201
228	MURTHY .S.S	20,001
87	SUBRAMANIAN .S.K	20,000
502	KRISHNAN .R	20,000
615	SESHADRI IYENGAR .K.R	20,000
1753	BRAHMADEVA .G.A	20,000
522	DHESI .S.S	19,999
517	GOPALAKRISHNA SETTY .B.S	17,000
539	RAO .H.S	17,000
48	VITTAL RAO .S.M	16,050
687	GUNDU RAO .B.K	15,606
36	MALATESHA RAO .N	15,500
1561	BHUVANENDRA .K.G	15,101
644	ATTAVAR YOGANAND	15,001
526	GUNDU RAO .G.S	15,000
767	JOSEPH .G.T	15,000
1143	IYER .J.S	15,000
1850	SUDHAKARA .R.S	15,000
537	NAGARAJA .H.L	14,550
67	RAMAKAMATH .H	13,250
737	SRINIVASAMURTHY .M.N	13,007
1364	PADMANABHAN .V	13,000
448	PRABHAKARA RAO .K	12,555
784	RANGARAJA IYENGAR .H.G	12,501
1170	VASUDEVAN .T.S	12,501
27	HENRY .G.R	12,500
46	PRAHLADAR RAO .V	12,500
598	SHANMUGHAM .V.S	12,500
707	BHAT .K.S	12,500
1227	BHANDARI .V.S	12,200
660	RAO .B.S.V	12,001

LM/ ALM	NAME	AMOUNT Rs.
384	RAGHOTHAMACHAR .A.K	12,000
637	TANTRI .P.R	12,000
546	KAMALAKSHI .S	11,901
302	SATHYANARAYANA RAO .S	11,602
296	CHOKKANNA .K.R	11,600
610	RAMACHANDRA .A.N	11,501
562	VARADARAJAN .N	11,500
794	PARTHASARATHY .K.S	11,400
594	KAMATH .K.B	11,200
375	SHENVI .M.N	11,060
1621	ANANDA SHETTY .B	11,001
245	HEGDE .M.B	11,000
922	SRINIVASA IYENGAR .M.R	11,000
928	BASAVIAH .B	11,000
1156	BABU .G	11,000
1520	CHOWDAPPA .M.A	11,000
689	KRISHNAPPA .A	10,910
358	IYER .G.S	10,850
1053	RAMA .K	10,800
1085	GOPINATH .M.N	10,701
18	KRISHNAMURTHY .B.N	10,700
499	RANGANATHA RAO .T.S	10,550
49	GOPALAKRISHNA RAU .K	10,501
243	SUBBARAMAIAH .B.L	10,500
32	DORAISWAMY .A.G	10,500
429	JANARDHANA RAO .S	10,500
938	VIJAYASEKHARAN .K	10,500
1015	MANJUNATH .H.S	10,500
1243	Dr. NAYAR .K.B.H	10,500
1397	ANNAPPANAVAR .T.D	10,400
571	VEERABHADRAIAH	10,300
1133	RAMAMURTHY .D	10,300
834	SHIVALINGAPPA .P	10,271
498	REVANKAR .M.R	10,225
1421	DDIT .Y.C	10,200
838	CHANNAPPA .B.L	10,159
70	LAKSHMANA .N	10,150
1197	VAIDYANATH .L.N	10,150
743	PARTHASARATHY .N	10,116
79	ABDUL JABBAR	10,111
843	MAHABAL SHETTI .G.M	10,111
1177	LAKSHMANAN .R	10,102
818	SRINIVASAMURTHY .A.N	10,101
1860	SUBBARAMAIAH .P	10,101
125	NARAYANAN KUTTY .P	10,100
657	SUNDER RAJ .S	10,011
1550	POOBALAN .A	10,005
603	CHANDRASEKARAN .T	10,003
851	VENKATARAMU .G.S	10,002
1038	SHIVARAM .K.L	10,002
199	KRISHNASWAMI RAO .B.S	10,001

Board provided in "Pensioners' Bhavan" indicating names of members who have donated Rs. 10,000/- and above. (Contd. on Cover Page No. 3)

ambulance facility should be provided. CGHS facility should cover all State capitals and be extended gradually to all important District Headquarters, where there is a substantial concentration of Central Government employees and pensioners.

1.2. The proposed Central Government Employees & Pensioners Health Insurance Scheme (CGEPHIS) should be made optional and made applicable only to those who are in far interior areas, wherein CGHS facilities are not available.

1.3. At present, additional Polyclinic is opened only if there are more than ten Wellness Centres in a city. This should be reduced to eight.

1.4. For better coverage of the beneficiaries and providing facility of easy accessibility through public transport, it may be necessary to locate Wellness Centres in central area and for this purpose, a liberal approach in fixing rent is very necessary.

1.5. As per the existing order, a one-time option is only provided for availing CGHS facility. The cost of medical treatment has reached phenomenal proportions. Some employees at the time retirement had opted out of CGHS without knowing the implications. A second option needs to be given to such pensioners.

2. Improving Quality of Service:

2.1. Inadequacy of staff: There is mismatch between doctor-beneficiary ratio and doctor patient-ratio among Wellness Centres. The same has happened on account of the application of the outmoded SIU formula arrived at on the basis of situation which existed in 1989-90, decision thereon taken after a lapse of 18 years in the year 2008 and implementation given effect to in the same year. According to SIU formula, a doctor gets a time allowance of only five minutes for consultation per patient. The Committee constituted in the year 2005 under the Chairmanship of P.K.Kaul, former Cabinet Secretary, had reviewed this aspect and recommended a time allowance of 15 minutes per patient (new cases) and 5 minutes for old (revisit) cases. According to the Kaul Committee, a doctor can attend to only 16 new cases and 24 old cases during his working hours against the

SIU-standard of 75 patients. A separate letter dated 27th April, 2013 has been addressed by the Association in this connection to the Hon'ble Minister for Health & Family Welfare, Gol. A copy of the same is attached herewith. Kaul Committee has not made any time allowance for CMO-In charge for his administrative functions like placing indent for medicines and checking them when received under the LP system, verification of stock of medicines in the pharmacy section, responsibility of upkeep and maintenance of the Wellness Centre including ensuring punctuality in attendance of staff and holding meetings. About one third of the working hours of CMO-In charge is involved in such duties.

2.2. Absence of leave reserve and delay in filling up regular vacancies: In most of the CGHS-covered cities, there is no leave reserve in the cadre of doctors and other staff. In respect of post of doctors where four to five posts were in existence, they were reduced to three posts after the implementation of SIU formula. If any doctor, out of three, takes leave or is deputed to other Wellness Centre or assigned other duty, only two doctors will be available with one of them engaged, for some time, with the administrative duty of the CMO-In charge. Patients are to wait for more than two and half to three hours for getting consultation. A liberal approach, in place of the existing requirement of minimum of four vacancies, for employing retired CGHS-doctors on contract basis, is necessary to reduce the hardship faced by CGHS beneficiaries. There should not be delay in filling up of long-term vacancies.

2.3. Shortage of Specialists: Posts of Geriatrician, Orthopaedician, Urologist. Diabetologist, Cardiologist, Neurologist and Physiotherapist should be provided either on regular basis or on contract. The Eye-specialist should be relieved of the routine duty of eye-test for prescription of proper type of lens by creating a post of Refractionists.

2.4. Empanelment of private hospitals/ diagnostic centres: Rates offered should be attractive and have relevance to the market rates. Some private hospitals, after getting the facility of empanelment, refuse admission to CGHS beneficiaries on some pretext or the other like non-availability of bed. These hospitals use the

“status of CGHS-empanelment” to get patronage of corporate establishments and through them, get better rates in giving treatment to their employees. They prefer patients from corporate establishment and neglect CGHS beneficiaries. Penal action against the empanelled hospitals is necessary in such instances. Some empanelled hospitals, especially in situations of “emergency” insist on depositing amount at the counter of the hospital before admitting the patient, make the attendants purchase costly medicines stating that they are not available in their pharmacy and at the time of discharge, do not reimburse the amount. They get the entire expenditure on treatment reimbursed by CGHS. The beneficiary is unable to get the amount reimbursed either from hospital or CGHS. Even if beneficiaries possess pre-operative test results got done elsewhere, in some cases, they are directed to pay for pre-operative tests stating that they rely more on their equipments and are asked to pay for the same separately. The beneficiary will not be in a mood to assert his right to get cashless facility in treatment. This practice needs to be prevented. It is necessary to insist on provision of dedicated counters for CGHS beneficiaries to avoid the situation of being “driven from pillar to post”. It is also necessary to ensure that all areas in the city are covered while empanelling private hospitals

2.5. Diagnostic equipments: Periodical review should be conducted to modernise the diagnostic equipments. A fully-equipped diagnostic laboratory should be opened in each CGHS-covered city either managed exclusively by CGHS or on PPP basis. Arrangement should be made to collect samples on fixed days from each Wellness Centre or from a group of Wellness Centres. Results of diagnostic tests should be made available to the beneficiary and treating doctor through internet.

2.6. Record of Treatment administered: A Patient Retained Medical Record (PRMR) was sought to be introduced as per letter No. 15025/2G/2005-CGHS-D1 dated 25-5-2005 of Director, CGHS, to provide a credible and reliable quality of health services. This Record would have indicated the results of diagnostic tests, allergies and treatment offered. Neither the patient nor CGHS has, at present, such a record. Only

medicines given to the patients appear in the internet.

2.7. Reimbursement of Medical Claims: Claim process and rates in case of non-surgical procedures and emergency cases should not be dependent upon the subjective judgment of the officers processing.

2.8. Procurement and dispensing medicines: The tendency of drug companies dumping medicines, the shelf life of which is about to expire to CGHS-drug procurement depots should be checked. Facility of LP system should be provided for Ayurvedic, Homeopathic and Unani medicines.

3. Improving satisfaction level of CGHS beneficiaries.

3.1. Better ambience should be provided in the Wellness Centres: The situation obtaining in CGHS Wellness Centre No. 7, Koramangala and No. 5 Vijayanagar is worth emulating. Display boards indicating the serial No. of the patient getting consultation should be provided at the entrance of the consulting room of all doctors. In the latter office, there is also a “Help-desk” manned by a volunteer from among the beneficiaries. T.V., newspapers and magazines should be provided in the waiting hall. Semi-reclining chairs in the waiting hall should be provided in place of benches. The facility of Advisory Committee and CGHS-Claims Adalath should be fully utilized. Punctuality in attendance of staff needs to be insisted.

3.2. Preference in consultation and treatment of Senior Citizens above 80 years: This was introduced as a result of the discussion of the Staff Side of the JCM with the Secretary, Health & FW on 4th August, 2008, in which an assurance was given that to begin with, instructions have been given in Delhi to Incharges of Wellness Centres to telephonically get in touch with these beneficiaries at least once in a month to know about their physical condition and in case of serious illness, visit them at their residence and also to supply medicines for three months at a time. It is not known whether this experiment is being continued and with what result and whether it has been extended to any other city. However, the order on priority in consultation for Senior Citizens above 80 years is only on paper,

as the facility is allowed only if the Wellness Centre has got its full-compliment of doctors on the particular day, which situation is becoming rare. This issue needs to be addressed.

3.3. Preventive health-check up/annual check-up and also immunization programme:

Preventive Health-check up was introduced in Delhi for beneficiaries above 40 years of age on experimental basis as per the order dated 22-11-2011 of MoH & FW. The results of the experiment are not made known. It is worth implementing. The possibility of introducing an immunization programme against diseases like Influenza, Pneumonia, Hepatitis for Senior Citizens needs to be explored.

4. Optimal usage of resources: Facility for updation of knowledge for doctors should be provided through in-service training and continuous medical education. "Fergusson

Committee on CGHS", which submitted its report in 2005 has commented about the redundancy of staff mentioning that "the role of nursing staff was to administer only about 10 injections in a week and the dresser does not have any duty to discharge". A thorough review should be made for redeploying staff by retraining and re-equipping for manning the new post.

5. Rational use of Medicines: Now that computerization of all Wellness Centres has been completed, a proper assessment regarding the nature, brand and quantity of medicines required is possible. Redistribution of surplus medicines to needy-Wellness Centres can easily be ensured.

Lastly, we would like to submit that CGHS is the best scheme for Central Government employees and pensioners and it should be further expanded and strengthened.

Subscription for Pensioners' Champion

Henceforth, members who join the Association between 1st July and 31st of December will have their subscription valid up to June of NEXT year. Members joining the Association after 1st of January and before 30th June will have their subscription valid up to June of NEXT year.

Members will please note that, hereafter, subscription for PENSIONERS' CHAMPION is to be renewed from the month of July and arrangements for **renewal has to be made sufficiently in advance before June for avoiding a situation of not getting the journal from July onwards.**

Members whose subscriptions for "Pensioners' Champion" are valid up to 30th June 2013 are advised to renew the same by 30th June 2013. Subscription (annual: Rs. 100/-) can be renewed by remitting the amount by MO/sending crossed local cheque/DD drawn in favour of Karnataka P&T Pensioners' Association. For proper accounting, while remitting by MO, membership No. should be furnished invariably in the MO form after the name in the remitters' address portion and while paying by cheque/DD, name and membership No. should be mentioned on the backside of the cheque/DD. MO may be remitted, Cheque/DD posted to

**Sri S.M. Vittal Rao,
Treasurer,
K P&T PA, 114/707, 2nd Main Road,
IV Phase, Yelahanka Satellite Town,
Bangalore-560 106.**

MO, Cheque/DD should not be sent to the Secretary at his Banashankari 2nd Stage address. Payment can also be made in "Pensioners' Bhavan", Telecom Layout, Jakkur, during its working hours; i.e., on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays (except Postal holidays). between 9.30 & 13.30 hrs.

Annual General Body Meeting, (AGBM), during this year, will be in September and members need not wait till AGBM for paying subscription.

**Request for review and revision of outmoded SIU (Staff Inspection Unit)
formula for sanction of doctors in CGHS.**

*(Copy of letter No. CCCGPA/CGHS/SIU 27th April 2013 from CCCGPA, Karnataka to Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad,
Hon'ble Minister for Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India, New Delhi)*

CGHS beneficiaries throughout the country are facing lot of difficulties in getting consultation in CGHS Wellness Centres on account of lack of adequate number of doctors. The average waiting period for consultation in most of the CGHS Wellness Centres is more than two hours and sometimes beneficiaries have to go home without getting the opportunity for consultation.

2. The SIU formula for sanction of doctors now being followed is based on the study conducted in the year 1989-90. The terms of reference were based on the situation obtaining in the year 1989-90. It was implemented in the year 2008, almost after two decades. The formula has become outdated and does not take into account the ground realities.

3. Our Association had addressed a detailed letter to your kind self on 15th February 2011. Our letter was acknowledged under your signature assuring us of necessary action. We regret to note that even after two years of taking up the issue, follow-up action appears to be wanting. We collected statistics for two days – (i.e., 5th and 7th of February 2011) regarding attendance of patients, sanctioned posts of doctors and the number of doctors actually present in respect of each Wellness Centre. Against an average strength of three doctors in each Wellness Centre, the average availability of services of doctor was 2.50 %. The average number of patients who got the facility of consultation was 77. With the time-factor provided under the SIU formula (i.e., approximately 5 minutes for each patient), neither the doctor attending on the patient nor the patient getting consultation facility has the satisfaction. There is no improvement in the situation even now.

4. The under mentioned new factors have cropped up after the last SIU report was prepared in 1989-90. As per the population statistics, the percentage of 60+ years of age group in the country has increased from 6.77 to 8.4 between 1991 and 2011. This is also reflected in the percentage of increase in the patients visiting CGHS Wellness Centres for consultations. They may either be beneficiaries who have retired from service or dependent

parents of serving employees. This group of beneficiaries suffers from some of the age-related chronic diseases like hypertension, diabetes, obesity, asthma, arthritis, cancer, dementia etc., singly or in combination with one or the other diseases with decreased resistance power to diseases on account of advancing age. They will be taking multiple drugs and will be having drug-related interaction and reaction. Clinical study of the disease from which the patient is suffering and deciding about the nature of treatment to be administered involves more time, unlike in the case of younger generation. Most of this group is devoid of the company of their children and grandchildren on account of various reasons and suffer from loneliness. Doctors at CGHS Wellness Centre discharge the role of family physician and have to resort to counseling. Such patients have a tendency to consult a particular doctor in the Wellness Centre. Considering the above factors, having a time limit of five minutes for consultation amounts to an unrealistic approach towards healthy doctor-patient relationship, on which is based quality healthcare-delivery. In the case of this group, more than drug-related treatment, faith and confidence which the doctor has been able to evoke in the mind of the patient and the ability of the doctor to give psychological treatment plays a substantial role.

5. The standard for opening additional Polyclinic – i.e., more than ten Wellness Centres - also needs revision. Polyclinic mainly caters to the requirement of the elderly-group mentioned above. Specialists are unable to give consultation for more than 25 patients during their working hours. Many patients visiting Polyclinic return disappointed being unable to get the facility of consultation. It is suggested that the standard for opening additional Polyclinic may be reduced to "eight Wellness Centres". Each Polyclinic may be provided with a Geriatrician and Orthopaedician

6. In the circumstances mentioned above, we request you to kindly take action for revision of SIU formula for doctors and sanction of additional Polyclinic and making available the post of geriatrician and orthopaedician in Polyclinics.

Revision of 1/3rd commuted portion of pension in respect of Government servants who had drawn lumpsum payment on absorption in Central Public Sector Undertakings/Central Autonomous Bodies - Stepping up of notional full pension w.e.f. 24.9.2012.

(O.M. No. 4.38.2008-P&PW(D) dated 3.4.2013 of DoP & PW)

Orders for revision of 1/3rd restored pension of absorbees, who had drawn lumpsum payment on absorption, were issued vide this Department O.M. of even number dated 15.9.2008. As per para 2A of the said O.M. the full pension of the absorbees was notinally revised w.e.f. 1.1.2006 in accordance with the instructions contained in this Department O.M. No. 38/37/08-P&PW(A) dated 1.9.2008. The payment of DR and additional pension to old pensioners is regulated on the basis of the notional full pension.

2. Instructions have been issued vide this Department's O.M. No. 38/37/08-P&PW(A) dated 28.1.2013 for stepping up of the pension of pre-

2006 pensioners w.e.f. 24.9.2012. Accordingly, the notional full pension of the absorbee pensioners would also be stepped up w.e.f. 24.9.2012 in accordance with the instructions contained in the aforesaid O.M. dated 28.1.2013. No arrear of DR and additional pension on notional full pension would be payable for the period prior to 24.9.2012.

3. Instructions have been issued on issuance of revised authority in respect of pre-2006 pensioners vide this Department O.M. No. 38/37/08-P&PW(A) dated 13.2.2013. These instructions will also be applicable for issuance of revised authority in respect of absorbee-pensioners.

Withholding of 10% gratuity from the retiring Government servants-Clarification

(O.M. No. 20/16/1998-P&PW(F) dated 19.2.2013 of DoP & PW)

The undersigned is directed to say that this Department has been receiving representations from individuals and Pensioners Associations that Government Departments have been withholding 10% of the amount of gratuity from each retiree even when they had not been provided any Government accommodation.

2. The recovery and adjustment of Govt. dues from retirement gratuity is regulated under Rules 71 to 73 of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972. Rule (1) to (3) of Rule 72 ibid provide for recovery of actual amount of Govt. dues in respect of Govt. accommodation from Pay & Allowances before retirement and from Retirement Gratuity. Sub Rule (5) of Rule 72 ibid stipulates that if, in any particular case, it is not possible for the Directorate of Estates to determine the outstanding licence fee, that Directorate shall inform the Head of Office that ten percent of gratuity may be withheld pending receipt of further information. The withheld amount of gratuity is to be paid back to government servant immediately on production of 'No Demand Certificate' (NDC) from Directorate of Estates. Thus, if no 'Govt. dues' in respect of Govt. accommodation are outstanding, then the rules do not provide for withholding of any part of the gratuity on

retirement of the Govt. servant. If no Government accommodation is allotted to a Government servant, in accordance with Directorate of Estate's O.M. No. 18011/5/1990-Pol-III dated 12.10.2010, it is for the Administrative Ministry to issue an 'NDC'.

3. As regards recovery in respect of 'Govt. dues' other than those pertaining to Govt. accommodation, the Head of Office is required to complete assessment of such dues eight months prior to the date of retirement [Rule 73(2)]. The actual amount of such dues and the dues which come to the notice subsequently and remaining outstanding are to be adjusted against the amount of retirement gratuity becoming payable to the Govt. servant on retirement. Thus, there is no provision for withholding any part of gratuity for the purpose of recovery of outstanding government dues other than those pertaining to government accommodation.

Sri H.Venkatakrishnaiah, LM 105, Retd. LSG Supervisor, Birur RMS, expired on 24.12.2012 at the age of 73 years. He is survived by a son and a daughter.

Our heartfelt condolences to the bereaved.

**Grant of Dearness Relief to Central Government pensioners/family pensioners -
revised rate effective from 1.1.2013.**

(O.M. F.No. 42/13/2012-P&PW(G) dated 2.5.2013 of DoP & PW)

The undersigned is directed to refer to this Department's O.M. No. 42/13/2012-P&PW(G) dated 4th October, 2012 on the subject mentioned above and to state that the President is pleased to decide that the Dearness Relief (DR) payable to Central Government pensioners/family pensioners shall be enhanced from the existing rate of 72% to 80% w.e.f. 1st January, 2013.

2. These orders apply to (i) All Civilian Central Government pensioners/family pensioners (ii) The Armed Forces pensioners, Civilian pensioners paid out of the Defence Service Estimates, (iii) All India Service pensioners (iv) Railway pensioners and (v) The Burma Civilian pensioners/family pensioners and pensioners/families of displaced Government pensioners from Pakistan, who are Indian Nationals but receiving pension on behalf of Government of Pakistan and are in receipt of ad-hoc ex-gratia allowance of Rs. 3500/- p.m. in terms of this Department's O.M. No. 23.1.97-P&PW(B) dated 23.2.1998 read with this Department's O.M. No. 23.3.2008-P&PW(B) dated 15.9.2008.

3. Central Government Employees who had drawn lumpsum amount on absorption in a PSU/ Autonomous body and have become eligible to restoration of 1/3rd commuted portion of pension as well as revision of the restored amount in terms of this Department's O.M. No. 4.59.97-P&PW(D) dated 14.7.1998 will also be entitled to the payment of DR @ 80% w.e.f. 1.1.2013 on full pension i.e. the revised pension which the absorbed employee would have received on the date of restoration had he not drawn lumpsum payment on absorption and Dearness Pension subject to fulfillment of the conditions laid down in para 5 of the O.M. dated 14.7.98. In this connection, instructions contained in this Department's O.M. No. 4.29.99-P&PW(D) dated 12.7.2000 refer.

4. Payment of DR involving a fraction of a rupee shall be rounded off to the next higher rupee.

5. Other provisions governing grant of DR in

respect of employed family pensioners and re-employed Central Government pensioners will be regulated in accordance with the provisions contained in this Department's O.M. No. 45/73/97-P&PW(G) dated 2.7.1999 as amended vide this Department's O.M. No. F.No. 38/88/2008-P&PW(G) dated 9th July, 2009. The provisions relating to regulation of DR, where a pensioner is in receipt of more than one pension, will remain unchanged.

6. In the case of retired Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts, necessary orders will be issued by the Department of Justice separately.

7. It will be the responsibility of the pension disbursing authorities, including the Nationalized Banks, etc. to calculate the quantum of DR payable in each individual case.

8 The offices of Accountant General and Authorised Public Sector Banks are requested to arrange payment of relief to pensioners etc. on the basis of these instructions without waiting for any further instructions from the Comptroller and Auditor General of India and the Reserve Bank of India in view of letter No. 528-TA, II/34-80-II dated 23.4.1981 of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India addressed to all Accountant Generals and Reserve Bank of India Circular No. GANB No. 2958/GA-64 (ii) (CGI)/81 dated the 21st May, 1981 addressed to State Bank of India and its subsidiaries and all Nationalised Banks.

9. In their application to the pensioners/family pensioners belonging to Indian Audit and Accounts Department, these orders issue after consultation with the C&AG.

ALL INDIA CONSUMER PRICE INDEX				
Month	CPI Base 2001=100	12 Months' Total	Monthly Ave.	% increase over 115.76
Dec 12	219	2512	209.33	80.83
Mar 13	224	2582	215.16	85.87

By. K.B. Krishna Rao

**Resolutions passed in the meeting of the Management Committee of CCCGPA,
Karnataka held on 17.2.2013 - Gist of replies so far received**

1. Increase in Fixed Medical Allowance to Rs. 1200/- per month - CCCGPA letter dated 9.3.2013.

"This demand has been examined in great detail. In view of the fact that the FMA was increased three fold from Rs. 100/- to Rs. 300/- per month in May 2010 (effective from 1st September 2008) at a substantial cost to the exchequer, any further upgraded increase in FMA at this stage may not be appropriate given the constraint on the fiscal side. Government is, in the interim, also contemplating introduction of Central Government Employees and Pensioners Health Insurance Scheme to meet the health care requirement of Central Government employees and pensioners. Therefore, the demand for any enhancement of FMA cannot be accepted at this juncture" (Letter No. 4/4/2013-P&PW(D) dated 15.4.2013 of Department of Pension & Pensioners' Welfare).

2. Restoration of commuted portion of pension after 12 years - CCCGPA letter dated 9.3.2013

"The matter relating to restoration of commuted portion of pension after 12 years was taken with Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance. Department of Expenditure on the subject matter informed to this Department as follows. "The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Judgement dated 9.12.1986 in WP No. 3958-61 has ruled in favour of restoration after 15 years. The present status of CVP being restored after 15 years may accordingly be maintained by the Government. Sixth Pay Commission, in its recommendations, has also not proposed any change in the period of restoration. In view of this, there appears no need to re-examine the above issue when it has already been examined" (Letter No. F 42.6.2012-P&PW(G) dated 17.4.2013 of Dept. of Pension and Pensioners' Welfare).

Donation for Association	
Name (Smt./Sri)	Rs/-
K. Babu Nairy (Well Wisher and Member D.K. Dist. P&T Pen. Assn.)	5,000

3. Merger of 50% of DR with pension with effect from 1.1.2011 - CCCGPA letter dated 9.3.2013

"Merger of Basic Pay/Pension with Dearness Allowance/Relief has not been recommended by 6th Central Pay Commission at any stage and this position was also accepted by the Government. Since a number of representations were received in this Department in the matter of merger of DR with pension, when DR crossed 50%, the matter was taken with the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure for consideration, but the same has not been agreed to by the Govt". (Letter F 42.6.2012-P&PW(G) dated 17.4.2013 of Department of Pension and Pensioners' Welfare).

4. Improvement in medical facilities - CCCGPA letter dated 9.3.2013

"The letter dated 9.3.2013, in original, recieved from Shri N. Bhaskaran has been forwarded to Department of Health and Family Welfare for considering the grievances raised therein expeditiously in accrodance with the extent rules/instructions under intimation to the representationist to whom a copy of tis communication is also being endorsed". (Letter No. 4.5.2013-P&PW(D) dated 15.4.2013 of Department of Pension & Pensioners' Welfare).

5. Enhancement of family pension for ten years in the case of death after retirement - CCCGPA Letter dated 9.3.2013

"This matter has been reconsidered as a number of representations have been received and it is regretted that your request could not be acceded to" (Letter No. 1.2.2013-P&PW(E) dated 12.4.2013 of Department of Pension & Pensioner's Welfare (Desk E).

Donations for the Building Fund			
LM/ ALM	Name (Smt./Sri)	Rs.	Progressive Total
	K. Babu Nairy (Well Wisher and Member D.K. Dist. P&T Pen. Assn.)	10,000	11,000
98	R. Subramanyam	500	3,720

Pension Crumbs

Millions of retired persons who are part of the EPF, are receiving pension amounts less than destitute and old age pensions.

It is incredible how anyone can be expected to survive on paltry pensions that the Government doles out. The Employees Provident Fund Organisation (EPFO), the World's largest social security provider, covering 6.91 lakh establishments and 855 lakh members, has simply not moved with the times. That is why, the Senior Citizens, perhaps, get indignant, at the end of every year, when they are asked to submit the 'life certificate' in proof that they are still alive to continue to get the pension crumbs. Even the proposed hikes, if and when implemented, will not bring any substantial changes in the scenario.

Yes, the maximum pension anybody got in the recent years whatever be the salary one received, say Rs. 50,000 or a lakh, was around Rs. 1,600. The pensionpaying authorities may justify this on the plea that the Employees' Pension Scheme came into operation only on November 16, 1995 and the maximum pensionable service has to be calculated from that date, although with some weightage to the past service, as provided in the scheme.

The pension formula is: Monthly pension=pensionable salary X pensionable service ÷ 70. The maximum pensionable salary is Rs 6,500 (raised in phases from Rs 300 in 1952 to the present level, Rs. 6,500 in 2001) on which contributions are collected. There is, of course, a provision for voluntary-employer's contribution without any ceiling. But, this Gandhian concept didn't work in business; not many are expected to go beyond the statutory limit. As a result, the EPF pensioners are getting just some token pension not sufficient to support their lives in the evening years of life.

For instance, those who work for full 35 years' service from their date of employment after 1995 (joined in 1995 and retiring in 2030) will be getting a maximum Rs 3,250 as pension (50 per cent of Rs 6,500 the insurable salary). So, how can one survive with that Rs 1,600 now or even with Rs 3,250 full pension in 2030? Note these are maximum possible sums, not median figures.

In fact, many people are getting much

lower than this sum. As per the Minister of State for Labour and Employment's recent statement in the Rajya Sabha, 83 per cent of the EPF pensioners are getting a monthly pension of less than Rs 1,000 while 27 per cent are getting still lower sum of less than Rs 500.

So, the Government proposes to raise the minimum pension to Rs. 1,000. This was recommended some time back by the Pension Implementation Committee (a Sub-committee of Central Board of Trustees of the EPF). While asking for raising the minimum pension to Rs 1,000 as an interim measure, the Committee had suggested for enhancing the rate of contribution into the Employees' Pension Scheme by 0.63 percent. Also, there are proposals to enhance the PF ceiling from the existing Rs 6,500 to Rs 15,000 so that the maximum amount of pension could go up to Rs 7,500.

No relief

It is clear, even with this hike, if at all it takes effect, is not going to be of great relief to the wage earners and more so without additional burden on employees. Unfortunately the Government feels that it is untenable, with the available resources, to give more to the pensioners.

A quick recapitulation of PF contribution, after the pensions came into being is in order here. The employees contribute 12 per cent of their wages not exceeding Rs 6,500 towards PF. The employer adds another 3.67 per cent, taking the total PF contribution to 15.67 per cent. For Pension Fund, the employer contributes 8.33 per cent and the Central Government adds another 1.16, both together amounting to 9.49 percent.

The Provident Fund Contribution received during last three years 2009-12 was Rs 1.51 lakh crore and the Pension Fund was 0.38 lakh crore. The total corpus of Provident Fund, invested and held in public account, was 2.37 lakh crore as of March 31, 2012 and that of Pension Fund Rs 1.62 lakh crore. These figures look very big but the actuarial assessment shows a deficit of thousands of crores in the Fund even to meet the current level of pension obligation, whereby recommendation pour in for higher contributions.

Whatever the reasons given, the pension sum is illogically low. It is naturally disgusting to the employee to receive such meagre sums. Substantial number of them are receiving pension amount less than destitute and old age pensions. The situation is undoubtedly anomalous. There is every reason to hike the monthly pension to all the EPF members; not some token amount, but towards some tangible benefit.

It is not only possible to do that, but the pension should be equal to 50 per cent of the last 12 months average salary, says Dr P. Madhava Rao, Senior International Governance and State Building Expert and ILO's Resource Person, who made an in depth study of Provident Funds and Pension Schemes across the Globe. While appreciating the ILO-102 norm of 50 per

cent salary, he wants its (the ILO's) definition should be the 'total salary' instead of 'insurable' salary which gave leverage to the pension administrators to fix lower limit like Rs. 6,500.

So, there is every possibility to hike the pension to make it equal to 50 per cent of the salary drawn during the final months of an employee's service - life. Since the Government cannot shun its responsibility of a Welfare State, it can enhance a little more towards its contribution to Pension Fund and can make the employers to pay more, particularly the big companies, with the norm of placing 'heavier weights on broader shoulders'. Thus, the Government and other stake holders should make the life after retirement of the employee livable.

Courtesy: Deccan Herald dt. 2.5.2013

VII CPC - Central Minister writes to the Prime Minister

In a letter addressed to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Union Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation Minister, Ajay Maken, underlined how every Pay Panel since the Second Pay Commission, barring the Sixth Pay Commission, were set up in the third year of the decade. "We are again in the third year of the ongoing decade and Central Government employees are justifiably looking forward to the VII Pay Commission," he said.

Recalling that it was under Singh that the last Pay Panel was set up in 2005, after the NDA Government failed to do so in 2003, Maken, in

the communication dated March 14, requested that a decision be "taken on priority" for constitution of the VII Central Pay Commission. "A notification for constitution of the VII Central Pay Commission is the need of the hour, which is bound to have bearing upon about 20 million employees" he said.

Maken concluded by emphasizing that setting up of the New Pay Panel was in "larger interest of Government employees as well as the (Congress) party"

Source: The Times of India

Courtesy: Railway Pensioners' National Digest 4/2013

Board-level and below-Board-level posts including non-unionised supervisors in Central Public Sector Enterprises(CPSEs). Revision of scales of pay w.e.f. 1.1.2007 Payment of IDA at revised rates-regarding

(O.M. F.No 2(70)2008-DPE(WC)-GI-ix/B dated 8.4.2013 of Department of Public Enterprises, GoI, endorsed by CGM, BSNL Karnataka Circle in his memo No. EST/1-134/IV/24 dated 18.4.2013)

In modification of this Department's O.M. of even No. dated 8.1.2013, the rate of DA payable to the executive and non-unionised supervisors of CPSEs (2007 Pay Revision) may be as follows:

Effective Date	Average of AICPI	Revised DA rates (%)
1.4.2013	221	74.9%

2. The above rates of DA would be applicable in the case of IDA employees who have been allowed Revised Pay Scales (2007) as per DPE O.Ms dated 26.11.2008, 9.2.2009 and 2.4.2009.

3. All administrative Ministries Departments of the Government of India are requested to bring the foregoing to the notice of the CPSEs under their administrative control for action at their end.

**Revision of Pension of Pre-2006 retirees-Delhi High Court dismissed
W.P(C)1535/2012 filed by the Government of India against CAT Judgment
dated 1.11.2011**

The Central government SAG(S-29) Pensioners' Association had filed an application before the Principal Bench of Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi, praying direction to the DoP&PW to revise the pension of pre-2006 retirees as per the modified parity/ formula recommended by the Pay Commission and adopted by the Government vide Resolution dated 29-8-2008. It was noted by the Principal Bench of CAT, Delhi, that, though the principle of modified parity, as accepted by the VI CPC and accepted by the Central Government, provides that revised pension in no case shall be lower than 50% of the sum of the minimum of the pay in Pay Band and Grade Pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale from which the pensioner had retired, the respondents, viz. DoP&PW, interpreted minimum pay in the Pay Band as minimum of the Pay Band, which is erroneous. As such, while allowing the application filed by the Association, the Principal Bench of CAT, Delhi, was of the view that clarificatory OM dated 3-10-2008 and further OM dated 14-10-2008 (which is also based upon clarificatory OM dated 3-10-2008) and OM dated 11-2-2009 whereby representation was rejected by common Order are required to be quashed and set aside, which they did accordingly, - vide the Order passed by them on 1.11.2011, and directed the respondents to re-fix pension of all pre-2006 retirees with effect from 1.1.2006 based on the Resolution dated 29.8.2008.

In spite of the strong observations made by the CAT, the DoP&PW, appealing against the Order of CAT, had filed a Writ Petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. After two or three hearings, the case was adjourned to 29-4-2013 for further hearing. In the meanwhile the Government, without waiting for the outcome of its Writ Petition pending before the Hon'ble High Court, had graciously accepted the demand of pensioners on modified parity and DoP&PW had issued necessary Order on 28-1-2013, which read as under:

"It has been decided that the pension of pre-2006-pensioners as revised w.e.f. 1-1-2006 in terms of para 4.1 and para 4.2 of the O.M. dated 1-9-2008, as amended from time to time,

would be further stepped up to 50 % of the sum of minimum of pay in the Pay Band and the Grade Pay corresponding to the pre-revised Pay Scale, from which the pensioner had retired, as arrived at with reference to the fitment tables annexed to the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure OM No. 1/1/20008-IC dated 30th August 2008."

It may be observed from the OM that the Government has not made any reference to the Order of the CAT Principal Bench, which had allowed the Application of the Pensioners' Association and had directed the Govt. to re-fix the pension of all pre-2006 retirees w.e.f. 1-1-2006 which implied that arrears of pension is admissible from 1-1-2006. But, the OM dated 28th January 2013 states that the Order on stepping up of revised pension will take effect from 24th Sept 2012, ie, the date of approval by the Government. Hence, no arrears was payable from 1-1-2006 to 23-9-2012.

The Government's Appeal, which was pending before Hon'ble Delhi High Court for further hearing, came up for hearing on 29.4.2013. As the Government had already directed, - vide its OM dated 28.1.2013, - that the pension of pre-2006 pensioners would be further stepped up to 50% of the sum of minimum of pay in the Pay Band and the Grade Pay corresponding to the pre-revised Pay Scale from which the pensioner had retired, the only issue, which was for consideration by the Hon'ble Court, was with respect to para 9 of the said OM which makes it applicable with effect from September 24, 2012, and thereby denying arrears to be paid to the pensioners with effect from January 1, 2006. The Hon'ble High Court noted that the Government of India has tacitly admitted that it was in the wrong and that the Tribunal is correct.

Further, the Hon'ble High Court also relied on reference made by the Division Bench of the Punjab & Harayana High Court in WP(C) No.19641/2009-RK Aggarwal & Others Vs. State of Haryana and others to the decision impugned by the Tribunal, with reference to an identical question which arose in the State of Harayana because Government of Haryana had adopted

the same policy decision of the Central Government. In the decision dated December 21, 2012, in para 26, the Division Bench of the Punjab & Haryana High Court has reasoned as under:

"26., We remark that there is no need to go into the legal nuances. Simple solution is to give effect to the resolution dated 29.08.2008, whereby recommendations of the 6th Central Pay Commission were accepted with certain modifications. We find force in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners that subsequent OMs dated 03.10.2008 and 14.10.2008 were not in consonance with that Resolution. Once we find that this Resolution ensures that "the fixation of pension will be subject to the provision that the revised pension, in no case, shall be lower than 50% of the sum of the minimum of the pay in the Pay Band and the Grade Pay thereon corresponding to the pre-revised Pay Scale from which the pensioner had retired", this would clearly mean that the pay of the retiree i.e. who retired before 1.1.2006 is to be brought corresponding to the revised pay scale as per 6th Central Pay Commission and then, it has to be ensured that pension fixed is such that it is not lower than 50% of the minimum of the pay in the Pay Band and the Grade Pay thereon.

As a result, all these petitions succeed and *mandamus* is issued to the respondents to refix the pension of the petitioners accordingly within a period of two months and pay the arrears of pension within two months. In case, the arrears are not paid within a period of two months, it will also carry interest @ 9% w.e.f. 1.3.2013. There shall, however, be no order as to cost."

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, in its Judgment dated 29.4.2013, has concurred with the reasoning of the Division Bench of the Punjab & Haryana High Court and has decided to adopt the same. Finally, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dismissed the Writ Petition No.1535/2012 filed by the GOI against CAT Judgment dated 1.11.2011 and upheld the decision of the Full Bench of the Tribunal without any order as to costs, while noting that as regards substance of the view taken by the Tribunal, even the Central Government accepts its correctness, but insists to make the same applicable prospectively.

In view of the above, we will have to watch and see whether the Government modifies its OM dated 28.1.2013 thereby giving benefit of re-fixation w.e.f. 1.1.2006 or further challenges the Order of Hon'ble High Court before Supreme Court.

Reserve Bank of India - On migration to CTS-2010 Standard Cheques

(Extracts from RBI circular DPSS.CO.CHD. No. 1622/04.07.05/2012 dated 13-3-2013 addressed to the Chairman/Managing Director/Chief Executive Officer of Banks)

" ... a.) All cheques issued by banks (including DDs/Pos issued by banks) with effect from the date of this circular shall necessarily conform to CTS-2010 Standard.

b.) Banks shall not charge their savings bank account customers for issuance of CTS-2010 Standard Cheques when they are issued for the first time. However, banks may continue to follow their existing policy regarding cheque book issuance for additional cheques, in adherence to their accepted Fair Practice Code.

c.) All residual non-CTS cheques with customers will continue to be valid and accepted in all clearing houses (including the Cheque Truncation System (CTS) centres] for another four months up to 31st July 2013 by creating awareness among customers through SMS alerts, display boards in branches/ATMs, log-on message in internet banking, notification on the web-site etc.... "

Newly-Enrolled Members

	(Smt)	Designation & Office in which last worked	Type & No.
1.	K.R. Manikarnika Devi	LSG - O/o. D.E. J.P. Nagar, Bg.	LM 2087

LM: Life Member

ALM: Associate Life Member

Nainital HC Judgment, which has settled a very favourable legal issue of date of implementation of SCPC Report. It has been clearly stated in this Judgment of Uttarkhand High Court that any other date, other than

1.1.2006, is discriminatory. - Denial on the plea of financial burden not tenable.

"These writ petitions have challenged a Government Order dated 14.3.2012 by which the Government has decided to give benefit of 6th Pay Commission recommendation to the writ petitioners' w.e.f. 12.12.2011 and not from 1st January 2006.

The petitioners in all the writ petitions are members of Provincial Armed Constabulary. They are holding various posts namely, Assistant Sub-Inspectors, Head Constables and Constables. They have stated in these petitions in chorus that hostile discrimination has been meted out by issuing above Order by the State Government, as other employees in other Departments as well as other employees in the Police Department have already been given benefits of the VI Pay Commission w.e.f. 1.1.2006, whereas these petitioners have been deprived of such benefit w.e.f. 1.1.2006.

It is further stated that recommendations of VI Pay Commission have been accepted by the Government and implemented. After accepting recommendation of VI Pay Commission, the Government can not decide otherwise. In this context, I have seen the counter affidavit filed by the State and I notice the basic fact of acceptance of recommendation of the VI Pay Commission report has not been denied. In my view, after acceptance of this report, the State/respondent cannot take different stand, according to their choice and wishes. It is true that recommendations of any report submitted by the Commission were not binding and it was always open for the Government either to reject or to accept it. In this case, in the counter affidavit, it is stated that after acceptance, the State Government finds that there is an anomaly; therefore, they have sent the matter to Anomaly Committee. I think that, after acceptance of the VI Pay Commission Report, this is not legally permissible. More so, it appears from the statements and averments made in the Writ Petition as well as in the counter affidavit that those recommendations of the Commission have been accepted and it has already been implemented to the cases of other employees of the State Government w.e.f. 1.1.2006 and even other employees of State police department.

Learned counsel for the petitioners says that this

is worst form of discriminatory treatment without any valid or lawful reason and further arbitrary action also as pick and choose policy is adopted. I find force in his submission and there is no reason or warrant to deny benefit retrospectively to these petitioners, as the same benefit has been given to other employees of the Government.

The learned counsel for the State submits that if this benefit is to be given to these employees then the State Government has to bear the huge financial burden which is not possible to do. I think such plea is after thought, as at the time of acceptance of the recommendation of the Commission, financial burden issue must have been thought of or considered. There is no explanation as to why the Government did not feel any financial burden to give benefit to other employees, whereas, such burden is felt while applying recommendations to these petitioners. Such plea is not simply tenable in the eye of law, therefore, I overrule the same.

Accordingly, I hold that the impugned order is wholly unconstitutional, as it cannot stand to the scrutiny under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. ensures the equality and this test for application of the equality has been fulfilled by the petitioners. Accordingly, I quash the impugned order. I, therefore, direct the Government to give benefit of the VI Pay Commission to the writ petitioners w.e.f. 1.1.2006. I am not unmindful of the fact that if the benefit is given from 1st January, 2006 to the petitioners, at a time the Government will have to pay huge amount of arrears in one go. Considering the submission of the learned counsel for the State, I direct the Government to prepare a scheme for making payment of arrears in terms of this Order by way of installment or otherwise. I think that these arrears' amount shall be paid off by any method within a span of three years from the date of receipt of the Order.

Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are allowed. There will be no order as to costs.

* * *

*K.J. Sengupta J (ASI (M) Vinod Singh & Ors vs
State of Uttarkhand & Ors WP Nos 584-588/2012, 1317/
2012 & 1382/2012 HC of Uttarakhand @ Nainital-
Date of Judgement 15.3.2013)*

Subscription of Rs. 100/- received for Pensioners' Champion

LM/ALM	Name (Smt./Sri)	LM/ALM	Name (Smt./Sri)	LM/ALM	Name (Smt./Sri)
68	V. Nagabhushan Rao	992	B. Srinivasaiah (200)	1670	G. Dhoolappa
98	R. Subramanyam	1169	M. Devaraj	1672	A.C. Shekar
224	B. Venkatesan (200)	1292	V. Ranganatha Rao	1715	Sundara Raju
392	Janaki Sethuraman	1295	V.S. Kalyanaraman	1748	R. Sundaram
428	K.Prabhakara Rao	1308	T. Gopalaiah	1872	N. Raghavan (200)
466	S. Rajalakshmi Prabhakar	1340	V.Venkateshwaran	1877	S.N. Gogi
577	S.H. Vyasa Rao	1367	P.L.N. Gupta (200)	1912	N. Venkatachalapathy
774	Martha P. Subbarayan	1388	G. Gopal	1927	G.S. Gururaja
932	K.R. Sridharamurthy	1463	Maneka K. Murthy (200)	1952	C.K. Shanmugham
962	Sunder Singh Edward (200)	1504	M.Govinda (300)	1981	H.A. Bharathi (200)
967	Marjorie B.K. Nair (200)	1510	Anantha Padmanabiah	1989	K.V.P. Gupta

Legal Matter

1. SLP-9031/2013: Government's appeal against favourable orders passed by High Court of Karnataka in WP-39121/2011-on extension of CGHS benefits to retired employees of KVS. Adjourned by the Supreme Court on 16.5.2013 and posted to 18.7.2013. The 3 months' stay granted earlier also automatically stands extended.
2. OA:789/2013 before the Principal Bench of CAT, New Delhi on PB-3/PB-4 Muddle: Adjourned to 18.7.2013. Printed copies of the Application filed have been despatched to all the individual Applicants by the AICCPA/Delhi direct for reference and record
3. OA-51/2012: Case of Sri M. Venkatesan before CAT, Bangalore: Adjourned to 4.6.2013
4. SLP(Civil) 10109-21/2010: Government's appeal in the Supreme Court against decisions of CATs and High Courts on extension of CGHS facilities to P&T Pensioners who were not beneficiaries of CGHS at the time of retirement. No action after 9.7.2012. However, notices have now been urgently got served (through the Additional Director, CGHS, Bangalore) to 4 of the Respondent pensioners/Family Pensioners. (where the Respondent pensioners have expired) perhaps, the SLP is likely to be listed for hearing shortly.
5. WP:15848/2012(S-CAT) Government's Appeal against orders passed by CAT, Bangalore in the case of Sri Y.C. Dixit, Retd. SSPos.: Last date of action - 8.3.2013. Pending for want of Petitioner's (Government's) response. Watch being kept.

B. Sadashiva Rao, President, K P&T PA and Chairman, CCCGPA, Karnataka

Regd. Journal

If undelivered, please return to:
Karnataka Posts and Telecommunications Pensioners' Association (R)
1397, 23rd Main, Banashankari II Stage,
Bangalore-560 070.

To

Edited, Printed and Published by **Sri N. Bhaskaran** for and on behalf of **Karnataka P & T Pensioners' Association**, 1397, 23rd Main, Banashankari II Stage, Bangalore-560 070. (Ph.: 26716198) and Printed at: **Omkar Hi-Prints**, No. 24, I Cross, I Main, Tata Silk Farm, Basavanagudi, Bangalore-4. Ph.: 26713020