

# PENSIONERS' PATRIKA

पेंशनर्स  
पत्रिका

VOL. VIII No 3      MAY - JUNE, 2024  
Bimonthly Journal of AIBSNLPWA (CHO)

Life Subscription: Rs. 1000  
Single Copy Price: Rs. 20



MAY DAY GREETINGS  
TO ALL OUR READERS

# MARCH ON... MARCH ON



**75000**

We are happy to announce that the Life Membership of AIBSNLPWA has crossed 75000 as on 06-4-2024, calculated on the basis of CHQ Quota received. Congratulations to our branches all over the country.



**Formation conference of Siliguri Branch**



**Hyderabad Tirumalagiri Conference**



**Monthly meeting: Bangalore**



**Gurgaon District Conference**



**Sawai Madhopur Dist. Conference**



**Kolar District Conference**

# PENSIONERS PATRIKA

BIMONTHLY JOURNAL  
OF AIBSNLPWA (CHQ)

Website:

www.bsnlpensioner.in

Email:

chqaibsnlpwa@gmail.com

GENERAL SECRETARY

**V VARA PRASAD**

Phone 9440000482

Email:vvprasad399@gmail.com

D No 54-19-31

Lakshmi Gokul Enclave,  
Jayaprakash Nagar, LIC Colony,  
VIJAYAWADA 520008  
Phone 9440000482

TREASURER:

**T S Vittoban**

Block-A, Flat No D-4,  
Air View Apartments, M G Road,  
Manappakkam, Mugalivakkam PO,  
Chennai 600125.

Phone: 09444923732

vittoban@rediffmail.com

EDITOR:

**P S Ramankutty,**

9447551555

psramankutty@gmail.com

EDITORIAL BOARD:

**V Vara Prasad**

**K. Muthiyalu**

**D. Gopalakrishnan**

**P S. Ramankutty**

LIFE SUBSCRIPTION

Rs. 1000 per copy

Editorial

## PENSIONERS ARE TAKEN ABACK

Ten years back, in the editorial of October 2014 issue of this Patrika we wrote: "The recent changes in national politics roused new hopes and expectations. Not because of promises poured profusely during the election campaign. Nor because of the declarations made from the ramparts of Red Fort in Delhi. We have seen several times in the past the 'promises' and 'declarations' vanishing into thin air soon after they were made.... We felt, on the other hand, that Prime Minister Sri. Modi can perform well, that he is not ambiguous at crises. We felt also that he has an amazing capacity to move the government machinery and reach his target. But, we regret to observe now, that the system remains as it was. The bureaucracy has not changed...."

We stated so 10 years ago. Therefore, we were cautiously moving to settle our long pending demand of pension revision. We filed a case in the CAT and pursued it even after the Hon. Minister gave a clear assurance on 25-3-2022 that "*pension revision and pay revision in BSNL cannot go together.*" We had a three pronged strategy: agitation, negotiation and litigation.

When we met the Minister on 28-7-2022 again he reiterated his view. We met him on 13-12-22 and 27-5-2023 too. Finally on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2023, we met him at Visakhapatnam. Every time, the smiling pleasant minister assured us that we would get pension revision. Even when the officers in Sanchar Bhavan proposed an appeal in High Court against the CAT judgement dated 20-9-2023, the Minister took a position that no appeal was required. At that stage we believed that he was a minister with a difference. When the officers sent more than one proposal to the Department of Expenditure we smelt a rat. We expected that the minister would intervene and ensure justice as directed by the Court of Law. Then elections to Lok Sabha were declared and code of conduct was imposed. Still we thought that a decision to implement the Court order would be taken, though delayed, after new government assumes charge. Now the Department has filed an appeal in the High Court of Delhi against the CAT judgement. The authorities and lawyers might have taken weeks together to draft the appeal documents running to 630 pages. We cannot think that the minister was oblivious of these steps. No fly can flutter in Sanchar Bhavan without the knowledge of the efficient minister. So, we are totally surprised by the action of DoT authorities. We do not trust upon the sugar coated words from any one.

Still there is time to do justice. The DoT can revise the pension with concurrence of Departments of Pension and Expenditure and then withdraw the Writ Petition pending before the Delhi High Court. Recently another department has revised IDA pension of FCI pensioners granting CPC fitment formula. It is possible.

Anyhow, we shall continue our struggles. We have full confidence in the credibility of our judiciary.



**GS**  
Writes

**WE SHALL FIGHT  
WE WILL WIN**

## APPEAL TO ALL MEMBERS

Dear Comrades,

All of you are aware that Pension Revision Case was listed before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 05-04-2024. Senior Counsel Shri Sanjoy Ghose has highlighted the Govt's failure to fulfill its promise and implement the court's judgment within the stipulated timeframe. The DOT's counsel requested an adjournment citing the need for the Additional Solicitor General (ASG) to appear in the matter. The court granted the adjournment but clarified that no notice had been issued, allowing the party to pursue a contempt petition. The next hearing is scheduled for 12.07.2024. As advised by our counsel, it is decided to file a contempt petition promptly as other associations are also planning to file similar petitions, and efforts should be made to have all the cases listed together.

Legal Fund: As per the decision of CWC at Ahmedabad in October 2023, to meet the legal expenses, all our members are hereby requested to donate generously. Members

may send their donations to concerned District unit which will forward the entire amount directly to the CHQ bank account with an intimation to Circle Secretary. Circles may please keep a close watch on the momentum on the collection in terms of quantum and time lags and encourage them wherever required. A minimum donation of Rs 200 per member is prescribed, with no maximum limit. A one-month period allocated for collecting these donations.

CHQ A/c Details : AIBSNLPWA (CHQ),  
SB A/c No 67100927818,  
SBI Branch: Chennai Nandambakkam,  
IFSC No. SBIN0002239

All our members are urged to contribute promptly to support the legal expenses required for pursuing the case.

6-4-2024

V Vara Prasad,  
General Secretary

**GREAT**

**RESPONSE:**

Within ten days, as on 16th April 2024, CHQ has received Rs. 40,28,289 as donation to the Legal Fund. [See Page 27]

## **CHQ WRITES ON 28/03/2024**

**To Dr. Neeraj Mittal, Secretary, Telecom, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi**

**Sub: Pension Revision to BSNL/MTNL absorbees**

The subject matter is well-known to you, sir. On this issue, we met you, sir, on 15/11/2023, 9/2/2024 in Sanchar bhawan and on 9/3/2024 at Bengaluru.

We were informed that DoT has sent the proposals to the nodal departments viz. DoP&PW & DoE. We were also informed, right from Hon MoC and all the officers in Sanchar Bhawan that they are not going to file any appeal against PB, CAT, Delhi order dated 20/9/2023.

We were taken aback when DoT has filed WP on 21/3/2024 against the judgement before Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The entire pensioner community is totally upset by this move and uncontrollable anger prevails. It is because that the issue remains unsettled for nearly 7 years and most of them 70 plus. Everybody thought that a solution is in sight to the issue.

We know that the issue is not so simple because it needs a policy decision. We also know that DoT officers had informal discussion with DoP&PW & DoE more than once. DoT is the administrative ministry and it has to send a single concrete proposal to DoP&PW which will take a policy decision in consultation with DoE. The leaders of the pensioners' associations have the rich experience of several decades and matured enough. But DoT was not willing to share the proposals with them, the stake-holders. We expect and request DoT to be transparent with the stake-holders.

We make a fervent appeal to you, sir, to convene a formal meeting of all BSNL/MTNL pensioners' associations at your convenience sooner than later giving atleast 7 days notice. Hope this approach would help to find a solution.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully,

(V Vara Prasad)  
General Secretary.



# PENSION REVISION

## CHQ WRITES TO SECRETARY, TELECOM

Date: 11/03/2024

To  
Dr. Neeraj Mittal,  
Secretary, Telecom,  
Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.

Respected Sir,

***Sub: Pension Revision for absorbed BSNL/MTNL retirees from 01/01/2017  
on the basis of PB , CAT judgement dated 20/09/2023- reg***

On receipt of the above-mentioned file by DoE on 14/02/2024, the officials in DoE, according to our information, considered the proposals sent by DoT. It is also understood that DoE is of the opinion

- DoT has to send **one concrete proposal** to DoP&PW
- DoP&PW has to consider that proposal and take a policy decision in consultation with DoE.  
(DoP&PW, way back on 14/01/2019 sent ID note to DoT on the above issue.)

And, **5 years ago, on 8-3-2019**, DoP&PW sent a communication to DoT vide No.4/02/2019-P&PW(D)/40504 seeking the following information:

1. DoP&PW also forwarded the representation from Committee of BSNL/MTNL Pensioners' Association dated 12/02/2019 requesting DoT to examine and sought the comments thereon.
2. Sought concrete proposal for pension revision
3. In the absence of pay revision to the employees from 01/01/2017, to undo the likelihood of anomaly for those who retire after 01/01/2017 what is the proposal
4. Financial implications

To avoid further delay we request DoT to send **One concrete proposal** in consonance with PB, CAT judgement dated 20/09/2023 to DoPPW, as directed by it, along with Proposal for post-2017 retirees to avoid any anomaly between pre-2017 and post-2017 retirees and the Financial implication.

This is the immediate need of the hour.

Thanking you

## 5 YEARS AGO, DEPT. OF PENSION ASKED DOT TO SEND A PROPOSAL

**DoP&PW OM to Dept of Telecom  
4/02/2019-P&PW(I)/40504 Dt 8-3-2019**

**Sub: - Revision of pension of the  
absorbed combined service pensioners  
of BSNL/MTNL, from 01.01.2017-reg.**

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a copy of representation dated 12.2.2019 from Committee of BSNL/MTNL Pensioners' Association on the above subject and to invite the attention of the DoT to this Department's ID Note of even no. dated 14.01.2019.

2. This Department has made the following observations on the proposal of DoT for revision of pension of the combined service absorbee pensioners of BSNL/MTNL

(i) DoT has not clearly brought out as to what would be the formula for revision of pension on pre-2017 absorbee pensioners and what would be financial implications on revision of pension as per that formula.

(ii) It has been stated by DoT that pay of the serving employees has not been revised in implementation of the recommendations of 3rd PRC, since these entities had not fulfilled the pre-conditions for grant of the facility to these serving employees. This means that serving employees of BSNL/MTNL continue to be on the same pay which they were getting before 01.01.2007. In that case the existing: Government employees would also be getting pension based on their unrevised 2nd PRC pay-

scale/pay. In case pension of the past pensioners is revised, their revised pension would become higher than pension to be fixed on retirement of the existing employees. This will create an anomalous situation in BSNL/MTNL as the past pensioners would be getting more pension than the freshly retired pensioners. DoT, therefore, needs to bring about as to how they propose to resolve this anomaly.

3. DoT was requested to reconsider the matter and provide information/comments on the above observations. However, the requisite clarifications/proposal has not been received from DoT so far.

4. It is requested that issues raised in the representation dated 12-02-2019 from Committee of BSNL/MTNL Pensioners' Associations may be examined by DoT, and the comments of DoT thereon, may be sent to this Department alongwith the clarifications sought in this Department's ID Note dated 14.01.2019.

Sd/-

(Charanjit Taneja)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

To

DDG(Estt)

Department of Telecom

Copy to

Shri Gangadhara Rao,

Convener, Committee of BSNL/MTNL Pensioners' Associations, Bangalore.



# REJECTED ARGUMENTS REPEATED

D GOPALAKRISHNAN

[Text of Voice message posted on 27-3-22]

Many pensioners want my reaction to the writ petition filed by Union of India on 21/3/2024 before Hon Delhi High Court.

Union of India was the respondent before Hon PB, CAT, Delhi and now they are petitioners before Hon Delhi HC. Whatever they pleaded in the counter before Hon PB, CAT, Delhi is again reflected as petition. The only addition is assailing the Hon PB, CAT order.

The writ petition filed by the govt. against the order of PB, CAT, Delhi dated 20/9/2023 has made the pensioners angry against the government because all along, right from Minister to top officers of DoT told us that they are not going for appeal against the judgement and they have processed for implementation of the judgement and sent the proposals to nodal departments. Most of the members want us to legally fight it out without minding the cost and they are willing to donate legal fund. We appreciate their approach. This justified anger should reflect in an appropriate manner at the appropriate opportunity.

## **The relevant portion of the petition and my Counter view-points on those.**

Para 3(l) – Strictly speaking, at the time of inception of BSNL and MTNL, the service therein was more lucrative as compared to the govt service therefore the employees opted for absorption in BSNL and MTNL.

**Counter** – The employees did not opt because it was more lucrative but mainly because of fear of going to surplus cell if they opt to remain in govt service. Further Govt only lured the employees to opt by offering a minimum monthly increase of Rs.1500/- to non-executives and Rs.2500/- to executives.

Para 3 (iv) – At then in PSU, the scheme of pension to be paid from the Govt was not matter of right.

**Counter** – After amending CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972, one day prior to formation of BSNL, guaranteeing govt pension on combined service to the optees, it becomes the statutory right of the optees. Several judgements of the Apex court have categorically stated that the pension is not a gratis but a right akin to property right, a fundamental right.

Para 3 (e) – These employees ceased to be the govt servant as per sub-rule 4 of Rule 37-A

**Counter** – Such a clause 4 in DoP&PW OM dated 5/3/1987 was struck down by 4 member bench of the apex court way back on 15/12/1995. Kerala High Court Division Bench – Justice K Vinod Chandran & J. V G Arun delivered a **judgement on 13/11/2019** stated



**“their right to pension as a government employee and the membership in the GPF remains protected”**. In the last para it was stated “Declaring the petitioners, servants of Union of India under the DoT, who on creation of BSNL, were transferred and permanently absorbed there under Rule 37-A with all the protections available there under”.

There is a similar provision in FCI Act 1964 that they cease to be a govt employee on the date of permanent absorption. In spite of that, Hon. SC judgement dated 10/2/2010 in UoI Vs P N Natarajan & others dismissed the appeal of the govt with cost and declared pension should be given on IDA and Dearness Relief on CDA

Para 3 (f) – In case of CGE, the pension is calculated on CDA pattern, as they receive their last pay at the time of retirement on CDA pattern, whereas in case of CPSEs, pension is calculated on IDA pattern, as they receive their last pay on IDA pattern. It is the matter of record that majority of IDA pensioners of BSNL and MTNL, more than 98% are getting more pension.

**Counter** – Let us understand the CDA and IDA pattern. Before 1/1/1996 DA was given on slab basis varying different percentage of neutralization for cost of living. After 5<sup>th</sup> CPC (under Justice Rathnavel Pandian), 100% neutralization for cost of living was granted for CDA on 12 months average but DA was granted every 6 months. In case of IDA pattern, after 1<sup>st</sup> PRC (Justice Mohan committee) 100% neutralization for cost of living was granted from 1/1/1997 on 3 months average. The difference is because of this one year gap and average calculation. So, it cannot be a reason to deny the pension revision. Earlier they stated that all IDA pensioners are getting more than CDA pensioners but now they state that more than 98% are getting more pension because we have pointed out the case of Com P S Ramankutty who is getting less pension compared to his counterpart in CDA.

Para 3 (g) – BSNL/MTNL pensioners are getting pension and DR thereon in IDA pattern on the basis of last pay/emoluments or last ten months average pay/average emoluments, whichever is more beneficial.

**Counter** – This is only partly true. Those who retired after 1/1/2006 are only getting that. But those who retired between Oct 2000 and Dec 2005 are getting the pension only on 10 months average (and not on LPD whichever is more beneficial) and that is why our association filed a case before Ernakulam CAT (OA 346/2018) pointing out the discrimination

Para 3 (u) – Pass an order directing the Department of Telecommunications to revise the pension/family pension/minimum pension w.e.f. 01.01.2017 for the BSNL combined service pensioners, who were absorbed from DoT/DTS/DTO w.e.f. 01.10.2000 and retired prior to 01.01.2017 by applying the fitment formula on IDA pension as on 01.01.2017

**Counter** – In our OA 1329/2020 the prayer was  
*i. Declare that the members of the Applicant Association are entitled to parity with CG pensioners in the matter of revision of pension on the same yardstick as granted to CG pensioners*

*ii. Direct the respondents to revise the pension of the members of the Applicant Association in terms of the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC*

*iii. Direct Respondents to delink the issue of revision of pension from pay revision for absorbee pensioners of BSNL”*

Para 3 (v) – It is also worth to mention that minimum pension/family pension i.e. 9000/- as recommended by 7<sup>th</sup> CPC is also not applicable to these IDA pensioners, as their IDA scales are different.

**Counter** – The minimum & maximum of IDA pensioners is related to the pay of CGEs. As a clarification to a doubt *whether the minimum pension of Rs. 1275/- p.m. as well as maximum pension of Rs. 15000/- p.m. (i.e. 50% of average*

*emoluments in all cases as applicable in the CDA pay scale is also to be applicable in IDA pay scales?*

DoT clarified vide its order dated 15/1/2003 that *The ceiling minimum and maximum pension as existing in CCS (Pension) Rules shall continue unless specifically approved otherwise by the Govt. When pension was revised for those who retired before 1/1/2007 as per DoT OM dated 15/3/2011 the minimum and maximum pension was linked to CDA pay scales and it was Rs.3500/- p.m. & 45000/- p.m. respectively.*

Para 3 (w) – That it is matter of record that the retired absorbed BSNL and MTNL employees were always on the beneficial position as compared to their counterparts in CG, as the IDA scales offered to them were higher to the existing CDA scales at the time of retirement and further they had better career opportunities in the PSU because of the time bound promotion policies of BSNL and MTNL.

**Counter** – Only IDA pay scales are allowed as per SC judgement dated 3/5/1990 followed by DPE OM dated 12/6/1990. So, it is not the choice of the optees.

Para 4 (A) – The impugned order is based upon surmises and conjecture and passed in pre-determined manner.

**Counter** – This comment is bordering ‘casting aspersion’ and uncalled for. Hon’ble PB, CAT pronounced the order after giving full opportunity to the respondents to argue their view-points. Not only their lawyers but also a senior officer in the rank of Director appeared and argued the case in person on 10<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> July 2023. Hon Judge asked the lawyers of both sides whether sufficient opportunity was given to argue the view-points and both said ‘yes’. Hon judge asked the respondents to read the relevant portion of the rule and asked the respondents whether the documents presented by the petitioner is genuine/authentic or otherwise. The respondents replied that they

are genuine. The order clearly stated to forthwith revise the pension/family pension wherever applicable, strictly in accordance with the relevant rules and the entitlement governing pension to various sets of employees of the CG maintaining strict parity. It is clarified that the benefits of revision of pension and family pension as notified by the CG the recommendations of the Pay commission, shall stand extended in favour of the applicants, analogous to the revision of such pension in case of CG pensioners. Then how it could be surmise and conjecture and pre-determined?

Para 4 (D) – The learned Tribunal failed to appreciate the moot question under consideration that whether without revision of the pay scale the pension could be revised or not. The Tribunal without any justified ground put unwanted huge financial burden on the Gol.

**Counter** – The Tribunal applied its mind taking into account that pay is paid by BSNL/MTNL whereas pension is paid by the Gol in accordance with statutory rule. This is unique only in these CPSEs. Pay revision depends on the economic viability of BSNL/MTNL but pension revision does not depend upon it. As long as they were in service, their pay/perks was determined by BSNL/MTNL with DPE guidelines. But their retirement benefits are not guided by DPE guidelines or PRC because there is no terms of reference In PRC for pension revision. The pay and pension of CGEs are paid by the Gol. When the Govt. could revise the pension of more than 60 lakh CG pensioners it is not a huge burden for the Govt. to revise the pension of less than four lakh BSNL/MTNL pensioners.

Para 4 (E) – the prayers of the respondent in OA were absurd. The implementation of order of the learned Tribunal leads to violation of the right to equality as enshrined under the Constitution of India.

**Counter** – The prayers of the respondent in OA were not absurd but the WP petition is only

absurd. Implementation of the order of the Tribunal does not lead to violation of the right to equality but ensures equality with CG pensioners.

Para 4 (F) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that the CPC is applicable to the Govt employees and not for employees of CPSEs. The Tribunal failed to appreciate that the respondents were given higher IDA pay scales as compared to their counter-part in the Govt service receiving CDA pay scale.

**Counter** - Consequent upon formation of Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking, all the employees of the erstwhile Delhi State Electricity Board were absorbed in the services of Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking.

The pay scales of these employees were higher than CGEs. For example when the Gr.D minimum pay in CG was Rs.2550 from 1/1/1996 it was Rs.3200 in DESU. When it was Rs.7000/- in CG from 1/1/2006 it was Rs.8500 in DESU. But they got their pay revised from 1/1/2016 as per 7<sup>th</sup> CPC. Minimum Gr. D pay in DESU is Rs.21800 whereas it is Rs.18000 in CG (order dated 19/2/2020)..

They have got time-bound promotion 1<sup>st</sup> after 10 years, 2<sup>nd</sup> after 18 years and 3<sup>rd</sup> after 26 years of service and they are moving to promotional scales and not mere financial upgradation. In CG, MACP is financial upgradation three times after every 10 years of service.

The pension of DESU pensioners is enhanced by 10% on reaching the age of 70 years, another 5% on reaching the age of 75 years to make a total 20% at the age of 80 years presently given.

Para 4 (H) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that these combined service optees employees/pensioners of BSNL and MTL had option to receive pro-rata pension based on their service in the Govt at the time of absorption in PSU. However, the respondents on their own volition opted for combined service pension on IDA scale because

of the assured and enhanced pension. Had they opted for pro-rata pension on CDA scales, it would have already been revised on the recommendations of the CPC.

**Counter** – This contention is totally false and misleading. On 30/9/2000, one day prior to formation of BSNL, when CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 was amended incorporating Rule 37-A, the option for pro-rata pension was deleted. So, the optees had only one option for govt pension on combined service or if they opt to remain in govt service, and if there is no vacancy, they will be sent to surplus cell. This is stated in this petition itself in para 3b “The employees who were on deemed deputation in BSNL and MTNL were given option to either continue to be in govt service or to seek permanent absorption in BSNL/MTNL”. Pro-rata pension was reintroduced in 2007 but with retrospective effect from 30/9/2000. But, before that absorption in BSNL was completed. No option was called for subsequently after 2007 from BSNL optees. More than one lakh pensioners have served in govt for more than 30 years. Infact 47000 optees retired before 1/1/2007 who put more than 33 years of service in DoT. In MTNL, earlier they had three options viz. 1) 100% computation (which was withdrawn on 31/3/1995), 2) Pro-rata monthly pension and 3) govt pension on combined service.

Para 4 (J) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that as per CCS (Pension) Rules there is no provision for the revision of pension per se and that too in case where the pay scale is itself not implemented in favour of BSNL employees.

**Counter** – The petitioner cleverly, conveniently avoided the year. Rule 66 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 2021 provides for pension revision. Further, the subject matter of DoP&PW OM No.4/14/2001-P&PW(D) dated 19/9/2003 is “Revision of pension and other attendant benefits of CGEs retired/retiring on IDA pay scales and opting for pensionary benefits of combined service in Govt and PSU”. It provides

for notional conversion from IDA to CDA but this was not implemented when pension was revised from 1/1/2007 because it would be against the provisions of Rule 37-A. Para (e) of this OM states *“Provisions of this OM shall not apply to the past pensioners of this category who have, in the past, been given a special dispensation on account of specific orders of the courts as accepted and implemented by the govt. Cases of this nature shall continue to be governed as per the existing provisions specifically applicable to them”*.

Para 4 (P) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that the counter-part employees of CG and the permanent absorbed employees of BSNL and MTNL cannot be treated at par with each other qua the salary and pension as both governed by different rules.

**Counter** – As far as pension and pensionary benefits, both are governed by the same rules and the contention of the petitioner is misleading.

Para 4 ® - Tribunal failed to appreciate that the respondents had opted for absorption under a PSU and therefore they shall be governed under the provisions of salary, allowances and pension governing such public sector employees.

**Counter** – It is only correct to the extent of salary and allowances but not to pension. So, it is misleading.

Para 4 (S) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that respondents are seeking preferential treatment to the detriment of other employees of BSNL.

**Counter** – We want only equal treatment for both pre-2017 retirees and post-2017 retirees in the absence of pay revision for them. So, it is not a factual statement. A mechanism can be worked out to treat at par both past pensioners and future pensioners who are absorbees.

Para 4 (T) – the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate that pension revision as per the recommendations of 2<sup>nd</sup> PRC was done to redress the anomaly in pension between past and future retirees of the BSNL employees, however, the Tribunal allowing the respondent’s prayer created another set of anomalies because in respect of 3<sup>rd</sup> PRC the pay scales of the BSNL and MTNL employees have not revised yet as was in case of 2<sup>nd</sup> PRC.

**Counter** – The last pension revision from 1/1/2007 for pre-2007 was not given as per recommendations of 2<sup>nd</sup> PRC. It is nothing but misleading. The petitioners are very much aware about it. It is reflected in the communication dated 8/3/2019 from DoP&PW to DoT. In fact, the Tribunal asked the respondents whether there was anomaly on earlier occasions and whether they have solved it. The respondents replied in the affirmative. Further, the Tribunal pointed out that they did not mention anything about it in Rule 37-A.

Para 4 (U) – a. OA No.346/2018 decided on 30/10/2019 by Ernakulam Bench of CAT

b. OA No.116-134/2018 decided on 27/11/2019 of the Bangalore Bench, CAT

c. RA No.021/02/2019 in OA No.813/2017, decided on 31/01/2019 by Hyderabad Bench, CAT

**Counter** – Our senior counsel Shri Sanjay Gosh have effectively countered all these judgements before the Tribunal.

So, the petition deserves to be dismissed. This is only my observation and we have to discuss with our lawyer elaborately and prepare the counter.

.....  
**Dear Friends,**

Few of our leaders have given some suggestions. Some comrades give their advise over phone in detail. We cannot write down all those. Hence we request learned comrades to send their views in writing. We shall definitely discuss the same with our lawyers.

# EXTRA INCREMENT CASE OF TN CIRCLE

CHQ letter dated 5-3-2024 to Shri A K Sahu, Member (S), New Delhi.

This is in continuation of our personal discussion on 09/02/2024.

DoT, with the approval of the Cabinet, issued orders on 18/7/2016 granting the benefit of merging 78.2% IDA with pension notionally from 1/1/2007 to 9/6/2013 and actual from 10/6/2013 onwards.

This was implemented by all the CCAs including PCCA, TN. When implementation process was going on, suddenly, on the basis of a clarification issued by BSNL corporate office, DoT issued an order in March 2017 that the officials who moved to restructured cadre are not eligible for this extra increment. The fact remains that all those who got the extra increment are from restructured cadre only.

After receipt of this order, PCCA, TN sent a letter to all SSA heads to revise the sanction reducing one extra increment. Because of this, 679 pensioners (TN circle-469, Chennai Telephones-192, STR-15 & STP-3) did not get the benefit. Some of them on their own volition got the benefit without one extra increment. More than 16,000 pensioners including more than 6000 pensioners (in restructured cadre) in Gr. C & D got the benefit with extra increment (under PCCA, TN).

Our Association filed a case before Hon. CAT, Madras Bench and delivered the judgement on 17/2/2022 and we quote the relevant portion of that judgement para 6 clearly stated that it is clear that the re-fixation had to be undertaken only because of the mistake committed by the respondents”

In para 7 it is stated “we hereby quash the impugned orders issued by the respondents dated 7/10.3.2017 (Annexure A22), June, 2017 (Annexure A24) and 8.12.217 (Annexure A29).

Against this judgement, DoT has filed an appeal before the Hon Madras High Court and it is pending. **Since there is no stay to the above judgement by Hon Madras High Court the position stands “status-quo-ante prior to 7/3/2017”**

In this background we submit the following points for your kind consideration and for necessary favourable decision in the interest of aged pensioners.

1) CCA, Kerala also denied the extra increment benefit to pensioners who reached the maximum of the scale in Grade II and our Association challenged before Hon CAT, Ernakulam Bench and got favourable orders. DoT filed an appeal before Kerala High Court and the appeal was dismissed. Ultimately DoT issued order dated 24th May 2016 vide No.38-26/2011-Pen (T) granting the extra increment even beyond the maximum of the scale (copy attached.).

2) Hon CAT, Chandigarh Bench also gave a similar favourable judgement and it was implemented.

3) The Executives who got extra increment for post-based promotion were withdrawn on the basis of audit objection. They have approached CAT and got the benefit though appeal was pending. But those who retired between July 2017 and May 2018 did not get the benefit. This amounted to discrimination. We have been continuously pursuing this case. Ultimately DoT issued order on 20/02/2023 vide No.40-12/2004-Pen (ST) (Pt) (copy attached for ready reference). This extra increment was granted by taking an undertaking from the pensioner that they would abide by the final court verdict.

We once again request you, sir, to take a similar positive decision in this issue also to grant 78.2% IDA merger along with the extra increment after getting an undertaking from the pensioners to abide by the final court verdict.



# EXTRA INCREMENT CASE OF TN CIRCLE

CHQ letter dated 19-3-2024 to Member (S) Telecom Commission, New Delhi

This is in continuation of our personal discussion on 9/2/2024 and our earlier letter dated 5/3/2024. We submit the following for your kind consideration and for taking a positive action.

◆ BSNL C.O issued orders vide No.27-7/2008-TE-II for Non-Executive Promotion Policy (NEPP)

◆ Para 5.2 states “*The promotion of such person who opts to continue in his/her erstwhile time bound promotion scheme viz. OTBP/BCR/Grade.IV/ACP etc. will be governed by the provisions of such schemes as existed on 01.10.2000 i.e. the date on which BSNL was formed, unless any change is specifically ordered or agreed to by the BSNL management after issue of this policy. All the concessions given by BSNL to Non-Executives in relation to OTBP/BCR/Grade IV/ACP etc. after 01.10.2000 stands withdrawn with immediate effect. However, the cases settled prior to the issue of this order, need not be reopened unless the employee himself opts for this Non-Executive Promotion Policy.*”

◆ All the 687 pensioners have not opted for NEPP and all of them retired between 2006 and 2010.

◆ BSNL C.O issued some confusing clarification on 03-04/03/2011 vide No.13-2/2010-TE

◆ Clarification to the above clarification of 04/03/2011 was issued by BSNL C.O on **04/05/2011 vide No.13-2/2010-TE.**

◆ Para 2 of this clarification states “*After issuance of the aforesaid clarification, it has come to the notice of this office that in some circles/units, the aforesaid clarification has been*

*interpreted as if the extra increment given in all cases after 01/10/2000 has to be withdrawn and accordingly the circles/units are resorting to the recovery of the amount already given to the employees due to the grant of this extra increment in BCR Gr.III”*

◆ Para 3 states “*In this connection, it is clarified that vide para 5.2 of NEPP order dated 23/03/2010, it has already been stipulated that the cases settled prior to the issue of this order, need not be reopened unless the employee himself opts for this NEPP”*

◆ Para 4 states “**Accordingly, it is reiterated that the cases of granting of extra increment in BCR Gr.III to the Non-Executive employees settled before 23/03/2010 need not be reopened and accordingly there is no need for resorting to the recovery from these employees, if these employees opt for continuing in the OTBP/BCR/Grade-IV promotion policy.**” So, no recovery was made to all these 687 pensioners.

◆ All the 687 pensioners got their pay/pension revision from 1/1/2007 with extra increment and it is part of wage settlement as per para 3.5 of BSNL C.O order dated 7/5/2010

◆ Pension is determined on the basis of last pay drawn and when LPD is not reduced, pension cannot be reduced

◆ Pension, duly authorized, cannot be reduced except under Rule 8 or 9 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972

◆ Pension authorizing authority can verify the emoluments of the official only 24 months prior

from the date of retirement and not before that as per CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972

◆ BSNL executives who got extra increment for post-based promotion was withdrawn on the basis of audit objection. Against this, they approached CAT and got restored. But DoT filed an appeal against the CAT judgement. When the case was pending before Hon. Delhi High Court, DoT issued orders on 17/05/2018

vide No.40-12/2004-Pen(T) (pt) to grant the extra increment after obtaining an undertaking to refund the overpayment if Hon. High Court judgement is in favour of DoT. Again a similar order was issued by DoT on 20/02/2023 vide No.40-12/2004-Pen(T) (pt).

**We request you, sir, to issue a similar order (DoT order dated 20/02/2023 vide No.40-12/2004-Pen(T) (pt) in this case also.**

## WHY THIS UNWANTED COMPULSION ?

### What is ABHA Card?

- Ayushman Bharat Health Account card is a government-organized scheme.
- It is open for all Indian citizens who belong to economically backward families, having annual family income of less than Rs 2.5 lakh. (Minimum pay of a central govt employee is Rs 18000 plus 50% DA now. It comes to Rs 27000 per month and Rs 3.24 lakh per year. Then how a govt employee can get ABHA card?)
- There is no fees for ABHA card. (For CGHS we have to pay lumpsum amount. Then how both can be equated? )
- ABHA card should be linked with your phone number. The Bank account number should be linked with your aadhar card. Your medical certificate is also required. Proof of your income is required. Domicile Certificate to verify your birthday residence is essential. Caste certificate is still necessary.
- Age: Those members of the family who are 16 or above and not more than 59 years are eligible for ABHA. (How a pensioner, above the age of 60 can join ABHA? The members of the family who are younger than 16 and not more than 18 years old can also apply for an ABHA Card, but only if they have a valid Aadhaar Card linked to their phone number.

Both ABHA and CGHS are different in nature, for different sections of the society. As such, there is no logic in linking both card particulars.

There are 45.02 lakh CGHS beneficiaries. 18.42 lakh are pensioners and their family members. CGHS has already computerized the data it has. It can easily port the data with ABHA with one click. Then, why CGHS is asking these 45 lakh beneficiaries to do it individually? Large number of pensioners and their spouses are unable to do it using new technology. Instead of forcing these senior citizens, CGHS authorities should share the data with ABHA, if it is necessary.

## ORDERS

### FP FOR PERMANENTLY DISABLED CHILDREN

DoT No 47/16-TA.II/PDA/2016/  
Pt.1/3220-21 dated 13-2-2024  
To Jt CGCA (BA&IT), New Delhi

**Refer this office letter of even  
No. 1194-1199 dt.14-08-2023, No  
1537/1538 dt.20-09-23, No 1942-  
43 dt.10-11-23 & No 2231-32  
dt.13-12-23.**

This is with reference to your office letter No 2-177/2022-23(BA&IT dated 23-11-2023 on the subject cited above (enclosing therewith O/o Pr CCA Chennai letter dated 08-11-2023) vide which it was requested to seek clarification from DOP&PW as to whether the stand taken by O/o Pr. CCA Chennai for insisting a disability certificate issued by medical board clearly certifying that the disability is of such a nature so as to prevent the disabled child from earning his or her livelihood, is in order.

2. In this regard it is stated that DoP&PW has issued orders/ instructions from time to time on the subject matter, however, the fact remains that interpretation of rules are best left to the judgement of implementing agency/ Appointing Authority. It is also not out of place to mention that Department of Pension and

Pensioners Welfare New Delhi in a reply to RTI application of Ms Parvathy, Chennai (Copy enclosed again at point No 3 of the RTI reply has mentioned that ) "As per Sub Rule (9)(h)(v) of Rule 50 of CCS (Pension) Rules 2021, before allowing the family pension for life to any such son or daughter, the appointing authority shall satisfy that the disability is of such a nature so as to prevent him or her from earning livelihood and the same shall be evidenced by a certificate obtained from

(a) An authority competent to issue disability certificate in accordance with Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 (49 of 2016), the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules 2017 and the guidelines and notifications issued by the Central Government or a State Government or a Union Territory administration.

OR

(b) A Medical Board comprising of a Medical Superintendent or a Principal or a Director or Head of the Institution or his nominee as Chairman and two other members, out of which at least one shall be a Specialist in the particular area of disability, setting out, as far as possible, the exact mental or physical condition of the child.

3. Further at Point No 4 of the RTI reply it has been mentioned that "The medical board referred to in

Rule 50(9)(h)(v)(B) is additional/ optional medical authority for this purpose and it does not prevent any person from obtaining a disability under clause(a).

4. At Point No 5 of the RTI reply it has been mentioned that "The rules do not require that the certificate to be issued by the authority competent to issue medical certificate would indicate the earning capacity of the person with disability. The rule only requires that the disability is of such a nature so as to prevent the child from earning his or her livelihood and the same shall be evidenced by the certificate issued by the competent medical authority".

5. As already informed at Para 6 of this office letter dated 14.08.2023, DOT HQ is dealing with Pension authorization work of staff of DOT HQ who are liable to inter ministry transfers. These cases are forwarded to Central Pension Accounting Office, Ministry of Finance, for payment of pension through CPPCs of Banks. Few months back, in the case of an Ex-SO of DOT HQ who retired on superannuation on 31.10.2016, disabled son has been co-authorized after retirement. Disability certificate of his son issued by Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, showing out percentage of disability and nature of disability (copy enclosed), Disability Certificate along

with copy of Unique Disability ID (Copy enclosed) issued by Institute of Human Behaviour and Allied Sciences, Tahirpur Road, Dilshad Garden, Delhi-110095 and a copy of Affidavit (Copy enclosed) regarding mental illness, date of birth, marital status. income was enclosed with the case. The other son of the Ex SO was appointed as guardian of the disabled son of Ex SO on a plain page (Copy enclosed) of the case was forwarded to Central Pension Accounting Office along with duly filled in Part IV of PPO Booklet (copy enclosed) and same has been accepted by Central Pension Accounting Office and forwarded to Bank co-authorizing the disabled son.

6. Few other fresh cases for co-authorizing of disabled children have also been forwarded to Central Pension Accounting Office enclosing therewith all the above mentioned documents and same have been accepted and forwarded to CPPCs of Banks.

7. Therefore, in view of the facts narrated above, the contention of Pr CCA Chennai to insist for a disability certificate issued by medical board clearly certifying that the disability is of such a nature so as to prevent the disabled child from earning his or her livelihood does not find any merit, is unreasonable, not justified, not in order and not agreed to by this HQ.

8. In light of the above, it is once again requested to intervene and direct O/o Pr CCA Chennai, not to insist on certification of earning capability of the disabled child/children from the medical board and

immediately do the needful for authorizing of disabled children/siblings as per extant rules and in the light of clarifications/instructions issued time to time by DOP&PW in the matter / RTI reply of DOP&PW to Ms Parvathy, Chennai, and other examples given by DoT HQ on acceptance of disability certificate and other documents by Central Pension Accounting Office, New Delhi.

9. Further, the case of Shri G Hariharasubramanian was settled by Pr. CCA Chennai on 24-05-2022 by co-authorizing his disabled daughter in Part IV of PPO (forwarded by DOT HQ along with copy of DOP&PW OM dated 24-08-2022 with a direction to take necessary action), however, no communication of settlement of the case by Pr CCA, Chennai was conveyed to DoT HQ in this regard. Hence it is also requested to instruct all CCA/Pr CCA offices to forward compliance of communication issued by DoT on relevant matters.

10. This is issued with the approval of the Competent Authority.

**CGHS: PARENTS IN LAW  
CAN BE NOMINATED**

CGHS OM No.H.11020/2/2023-  
EHS dt 26-7-2023

The undersigned is directed to refer to the Office memorandum No. 4(1)-18/63-H, dated 03.03.1987, issued by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, whereby a female Central Government employee was given

the choice to include either her parents or parents-in-law for the purpose of availing the benefits under Central Government Health Scheme (CGHS) subject to the conditions of dependence and residence, etc., being satisfied.

2. The matter has been reviewed and the undersigned is directed to convey the approval of Competent Authority to say that hereinafter, both male and female Central Government employees will have the choice to include either their parents or parents-in-law for the purpose of availing the benefits under CGHS subject to the conditions of dependence and residence, etc., being satisfied.

3. The contents of Para 2 above shall be added to the definition of the term 'Family' for CGHS benefits.

4. This OM shall supersede all other OMs issued in relation to this subject.

**ANNUAL HEALTH CHECK UP**

CGHS OM F.No.Z.16025/12/2024/  
CGHS-III Dated 18.03.2024

The undersigned is directed to refer to this Ministry's OM No. Z15025/36/2019/DIR/CGHS/CGHS(P) dated 19.08.2019 on the subject mentioned above regarding the entitlement of CGHS beneficiaries (Primary Card Holders) aged 75 years for Annual Health Check-up at CGHS empanelled Hospitals by obtaining the permission from the CMO incharge of CGHS Wellness Centre.

2. However, it is found that there are instances of complaints from

Pensioners' Associations against non-issuance of permission by the CGHS Wellness Centre for Annual Health Check-up to the CGHS beneficiaries.

3. In view of the above, all in charge of CGHS Wellness Centres across the country are hereby advised to adhere to the instructions contained in the ibid orders and directed to issue permission to the CGHS beneficiaries accordingly.

**LINK CGHS CARD WITH ABHA**

F. No. Z15025/23/2023/DIR/CGHS  
Dt 28-3-2024

This is in reference to the department's O.M. No. 44/67/MCTC/

CGHS dated January 2023 (I/3565787/2023) on the subject of Linking of CGHS Beneficiary ID with the ABHA (Ayushman Bharat Health Account) ID. It has now been decided that linking of CGHS beneficiary ID with ABHA ID shall be mandatory w.e.f 1st April 2024. The linking of CGHS Beneficiary ID with ABHA ID shall be completed within 30 days by all existing CGHS Beneficiaries..

**DATE EXTENDED**

CGHS OM NO. F. No. Z15025/23/2023/DIR/CGHS Dt. 15-04-2024

In continuation of the OM No. Z-15025/23/2023/DIR/CGHS, dated

28.03.2024, it is hereby brought to the notice of CGHS beneficiaries, that:

A) Creation of ABHA ID (ABHA number) has been extended for a time period of 90 days, w.e.f. 30.06.2024 (3 months from 30.06.2024).

B) Linking of ABHA number with CGHS card has been extended for a time period of 120 days, w.e.f. 30.06.2024 (4 months from 30.06.2024).

C) In order to assist the CGHS beneficiaries, KIOSKS shall be made operational at all the wellness centres by 30.06.2024.

## STRANGE ACTIONS

In January 2023, CGHS issued an OM (without any date) asking all CGHS beneficiaries to link their CGHS Cards with Ayushman Bharat Cards. Many organizations opposed the said order. Then, on 18-3-2023 Govt. issued a statement through PIB that the said OM from CGHS was fake. Now, again, on 28-3-2024, CGHS issued same instructions. Immediately, AIBSNLPWA and some other organizations protested. Then at 12.40 night of 4th April 2024 the Health Ministry issued a statement through Press Information Bureau. Extracts from the said PIB Press Release are given below. Faced with widespread opposition, CGHS has now extended the date for linking.

### MYTH VERSUS REALITY:

*Myth 1:* Does getting ABHA Number mean enrolment in Ayushman Bharat – Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana (AB-PMJAY)?

**Reality:** No, ABHA is just an account/ number used to link all the health records of a person.

*Myth 2:* What is not entailed under Ayushman Bharat Health Account?

**Reality:** Ayushman Bharat Health Account does not mean the eligibility of a person for the particular scheme including AB-PMJAY.

Ayushman Bharat Health Account is not a replacement of current CGHS services or a replacement of current CGHS HMIS. Rather it is an addition/add-on to the current services offered by CGHS.

*Myth 3:* I am afraid that by linking all my health records to my ABHA other doctors may be in a position to see all my medical History which I don't want to show. How can this be prevented?

**Reality:** The consent provided digitally need not be for all the health records linked to ABHA



at a time. It can be provided for sharing only selected health records as per the choice of the patient. Therefore, by linking all your health records to your ABHA you will not end up sharing all your health records when providing consent. The consent is granular “which can be provided separately for each of the health records as per the wish of the patient”. However, it is recommended that you provide consent to share all health records with your doctor so that he can make correct clinical decisions.

*Myth 4:* Is it possible for the government or any other entity to do surveillance of the health status of an individual through ABDM?

**Reality:** No. The health records are created and stored at the place of their creation by respective healthcare providers (which is the case even now). ABDM is creating interoperable platforms for linking these data repositories/fiduciaries. This is known as federated architecture. This means that the health records will continue to be processed and stored at the same place where they are created, which has been happening prior to ABDM as well. The government will not have access to such data. No additional means of accessing such data is being created or envisaged in the current ecosystem.

*Myth 5 :* Will my Digital health Records be shared with other doctors or health facility without my permission?

**Reality:** No. Only you can share your own records with other doctors/hospitals using different digital health systems after giving your consent.

*Myth 6:* How will my data be used by the government?

**Reality:** Protocols for anonymization and aggregation of data and use of such data will be defined after extensive stakeholder

consultations. After that, anonymous records can be used by the government to make policies and other relevant interventions in the interests of the public. Till this is done, health records will not be used by the government.

*Myth 7:* Are my health records safe and Secure on ABDM System?

**Reality:** ABDM does not store any medical records. These are always created and stored by healthcare providers as per their retention policies and this will continue. ABDM only facilitates secure data exchange between the intended stakeholders on ABDM network after the patient’s consent. Hence, through ABDM compliant applications, patients will also be able to choose which health records they want to link with their Health IDs, securely store their digital health records on their devices, securely access their records online, and securely share their health records with healthcare providers after the patient’s consent. Only the data collected for registries such as Health ID registry, Healthcare Professional Registry and Healthcare Facility Registry is stored centrally. It is necessary for these datasets to be stored centrally because they are essential to provide interoperability, trust, and identification and single source of truth across different digital health systems. This data is stored and processed in secure and safe manner.

*Myth 8:* Can ABHA be used outside the government hospital/CGHS?

**Reality:** Yes, ABHA can be used outside the government hospital/ program. However, it is up to the private players to decide whether they want to use it or not. For example, a private hospital may decide to use ABHA for creation and linking of health record. If the patient is not willing to use ABHA, the hospital/ program may provide an alternate number which they are using as part of their existing system.

## **Grant of Notional Increment: A Landmark Decision for Retired CPWD Officials (File no, 2/3/2023-EC-IV(SC)/190-E) Dt. 20-2-2024**

In a significant development for retired officials of the Central Public Works Department (CPWD), the Director General of CPWD issued an Office Memorandum announcing the implementation of a crucial judgment regarding the grant of notional increment. The memorandum, dated February 20, 2024, highlights the culmination of a legal battle initiated by retired CPWD officials seeking pensionary benefits in line with their entitlements.

**Background:** Retired CPWD officials, superannuated on June 30th and December 31st, approached the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT) seeking the benefits of a notional increment. Their contention was that their pensions should have been fixed by considering the increment due immediately following their respective dates of superannuation.

**Judicial Pronouncement:** The Hon'ble CAT (PB) New Delhi ruled in favor of the applicants, citing similar judgments and legal precedents. Despite challenges, including a writ petition filed in the Delhi High Court, the judicial journey culminated in a directive in favor of the retired officials.

**Supreme Court's Verdict:** Supreme Court of India, in Civil Appeal No. 2471 of 2023, upheld the rights of the retired officials to receive one annual increment earned on the last day of their service. This landmark judgment affirmed the principles of fairness and equity in pensionary benefits.

**Government's Response:** Following the directives of the judiciary, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), as the competent authority, approved the implementation of the CAT judgment. This decision underscores the government's commitment to upholding the rights and welfare of its retired employees.

**Implementation Process:** The CPWD has been directed to implement the judgment of the CAT for all retired officials who were party to the legal proceedings. This includes verifying the records of the petitioners and ensuring prompt action in compliance with the court's orders.

The implementation of this judgment holds profound significance for retired CPWD officials, ensuring that they receive their rightful pensionary benefits in accordance with established legal principles. It reflects the government's commitment to justice and fairness in its dealings with its employees, even after their retirement.

This Office Memorandum serves as a testament to the resilience and perseverance of retired CPWD officials in their pursuit of justice. By upholding their rights through legal avenues, they have not only secured their own welfare but also set a precedent for future cases concerning pensionary benefits in the public sector.

---

**Note:** The above mentioned order issued by CPWD is applicable only to those CPWD pensioners who were petitioners in the case, and, not a general order. That is the game. Please refer the detailed write-up given in the previous issue of this Patrika

# SUPREME COURT PULLS UP THE GOVT. OVER RISING DISPARITY IN MEDICAL EXPENSES

The Supreme Court of India has come down heavily on the Central government over the rising disparity in medical expenses between government and private facilities. The SC said citizens of India have a fundamental right to healthcare and when it comes to this matter, the Centre cannot shirk its responsibility.

For example, cataract surgery in a government hospital costs up to Rs 10,000 while the same goes up to anywhere between Rs 30,000-1,40,000 in a private facility. The SC has taken strong exception to this particular disparity. It further took on the Centre seeking implementation of the 14-year-old Clinical Establishment (Central Govt) Rules which mandates the notification of a standard rate in consultation with states for the treatment and procedures of ailments in metros, cities and towns. Centre shifted the burden on the state govt. claiming that it has written to the states repeatedly but got no response. The SC has asked the Union health secretary to call a meeting of his state counterparts to ensure notification of a standard rate within a month. "If Union govt fails to find a solution, then we will consider petitioner's plea for implementing CGHS prescribed standards.

## The case

'Veterans Forum for Transparency in Public Life,' an NGO, represented by advocate Danish Zubair Khan, filed a Public Interest Litigation asking the court to direct the Centre to determine the fee rates applicable to patients according to Rule 9 of the Clinical Establishment Rules, 2012. Under the Rules, all hospitals and clinical establishments, to keep intact their registration, must "display rates charged for each type of service provided and facilities available for benefit of patients at a conspicuous place in vernacular as well as in English language; and charge rates for each type of procedures and services within range of rates determined and issued by Centre from time to time, in consultation with state govts."

The petitioner informed a bench comprising Justices B R Gavai and Sandeep Mehta that the Central govt promptly implemented standardized treatment rates for patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. The petitioner further suggested that in cases where states did not cooperate in framing a range of rates for various treatments, the Centre could use its authority to unilaterally declare fees for different medical procedures. **[Economic Times on 28-2-2024]**

---

## BEWARE; COURT IS WATCHING

Recently, the Karnataka High Court noted that Bureaucracy has not honoured decisions of Court in many cases such as CCC332/2024, CCC306/2024, CCC107/24, CCC235/24, WA 42/2013. (vi), CCC236/24, CCC 237/24, CCC 123/24, CCC75/24, CCC1188/24 and CCC485/2023. The Hon'ble HC has issued notice to various Departments of Karnataka Government asking to explain the reasons for disobedience of court orders. The HC will hear the matter next on 4-6-2024. HC has told that "The entire purpose is to streamline the procedure for compliance of the orders and directions of the courts... The beneficiaries are the class of litigants, who will be benefited if the authorities activate themselves to discharge their constitutional duty to obey and implement the orders of the courts without looking any delay on their part, without which, it will not be possible for the litigants to enjoy the results of the litigation which may have ended in their favour. All the more, the orders of the court are the source of rights and obligations of the litigants."

# SUPREMECOURT ENDS THE IMMUNITY

On 4-3-2024, in a landmark judgment, the Supreme Court ruled that MPs and MLAs cannot claim any immunity from prosecution for accepting bribes to cast a vote or make a speech in the House in a particular fashion. Article 105(2) of the Indian Constitution confers on MPs immunity from prosecution in respect of anything said or any vote given in Parliament or on any parliamentary committee. Article 194(2) grants similar protection to MLAs.

## Background

The tenth Lok Sabha election, which took place in 1991, provided the case's context. PV Narasimha Rao was appointed prime minister and the Congress emerged as the single largest party. In July 1993, a no confidence motion was moved against the government. In the House the Congress was short by 14 votes for simple majority. On July 26, 1993, the motion was put to vote, and the Narasimha Rao government sailed through by garnering 265 votes. Several MPs who voted against the no-confidence motion were from Jharkhand Mukti Morcha and the Janata Dal (Ajit). But Ajit Singh, a JD (A) MP, himself did not vote.

A complaint was filed before the CBI alleging that the Narasimha Rao government distributed over Rs. 3 crore as bribe to MPs of different political parties. CBI took up the investigation under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 against JMM chief Shibu Soren and three other party MPs. The investigating agency also filed a separate case against Rao and others for hatching a criminal conspiracy and paying bribes to MPs. Charge sheets were filed before CBI court in Delhi where the accused MPs took the defence that the action by the court is barred by Article 105(2). The CBI judge rejected the argument and even the Delhi high court put a stamp of approval on it by saying that the illegal transaction took place outside Parliament.

An appeal was filed in Supreme Court and a Constitution bench of five judges heard it. The verdict that came on July 17, 1998, was not unanimous. While the judges agreed on the issue that MPs are public servants, there was difference of opinion on whether Article 105 immunity is to be a shield for MPs against criminal proceedings for bribery. The majority decision was given by justices SP Bharucha and S Rajendra Babu, supported by a separate view by justice GN Ray. They held that the alleged bribe takers are entitled to immunity conferred by Article 105(2).

Years later, in March 2012, the Election Commission of India notified election to two vacant seats of the Rajya Sabha from Jharkhand. Sita Soren, the daughter-in-law of JMM patriarch Shibu Soren, was then a member of the Jharkhand legislative assembly. She was accused of accepting a bribe from an independent candidate in exchange for supporting him. However, it was clear from the open voting for the Rajya Sabha seat that she voted for a candidate from her own party rather than the alleged bribe-giver.

A Public Interest Litigation came before the Jharkhand high court, which directed the CBI to probe into the allegation. Before the trial court and the high court, Sita Soren claimed immunity against prosecution under Article 194(2), but to no avail.

On being denied the protection, she approached the Supreme Court in 2014, banking on the 1998 ruling in the Narasimha Rao case. In March 2019, a three-judge bench referred the matter to a five-judge bench, which in turn referred the issue to a seven-judge bench in September last year. Now the final decision has come from the seven judges bench.

# LEST WE FORGET

P S Ramankutty

## Let us all recollect:

◆ In September 2013, Manmohan Singh Government announced its decision to constitute 7th Central Pay Commission.

◆ In November 2013, our CWC meeting held at Ernakulam constituted a sub committee to evolve our demand for future pension revision. In April 2014, next CWC meeting held in Chennai approved the demand for pension revision with CPC fitment benefit, To ensure consensus on it, we circulated it to all BSNL pensioners' associations including AIBDPA.

◆ On 28-2-2014, the Government formally constituted Seventh CPC.

◆ 14-6-2014: On our request, Bharat Central Pensioners' Confederation convened a meeting of all BSNL Pensioners' organizations in Chennai to arrive at some consensus on the demand. Late S K Vyas and other leaders supported our views. In the said meeting AIBDPA representative first agreed to it but later told that they wanted same fitment at par with serving employees. Com. Pabitra Chakraborty of AIBDPA from West Bengal also agreed with our views. Since efforts for consensus failed, it was decided to submit separate memoranda to CPC.

◆ 23-7-2014: BCPC submitted a memorandum to CPC endorsing our views.

◆ 24-8-2014: We met the CPC, submitted our memorandum and gave oral evidence in Bangalore. Chairman of 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, J. Mathur, commented that our demand merits consideration as it is justified prima facie. CPC forwarded our memorandum to DoT promptly. But DoT deliberately delayed its comments. **The game of sabotage started then.**

◆ 4-8-2015: AIBSNLPWA leaders met Mr Garg, the then Secretary Telecom who assured that comments would be sent soon to CPC. By the time the DoT's comments reached CPC the time limit was over.

◆ 19-11-2015: 7th CPC submitted its report to the Govt without any recommendation on our Pension Revision.

## **This is the root cause for delay of our pension revision.**

◆ On 8-3-2019, DoP&PW forwarded our letter to the DoT for their comments. (Please see Page 7). DoT officers did not respond for five long years. They are responsible for the delay of pension revision. The officers should be made accountable.

After a legal battle, lasting 30 months, we won the case in PB of CAT. There cannot be any doubt about the unambiguous direction from CAT. But, the officers in Sanchar Bhavan have not yet honoured the order. They should be made accountable for this wilful disobedience of judicial orders.

We met the Minister Shri Vaishnav for the first time on 15-3-2022. He categorically declared that "*Pension revision and Pay revision cannot go together.*" Thereafter we met him at least four times. Every time he assured us that we would get pension revision. On the last occasion, on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2023, MoC indicated that no Appeal would be filed against the CAT order. Moreover, the Secretary, Telecom also indicated that DoT has sent some proposal to DoE to implement CAT order. It made us believe that DoT would not file any Appeal.



# THE CONTEMPT

P S Ramankutty

Now some friends accuse us that we failed to understand the “class character” of Modi Government. Anyone who remembers our experience in P&T or the Central Services, know very well that our Union leaders had approached the ministers from time to time when bureaucracy adopted negative approach towards the issues of workers. There was no alternative. Today too there is no alternative. As individuals the members have political views of their choice. But, as an organization representing all shades of political views, our Association cannot take a political stand. We have to settle the issues. We have to act within our limits also.

Some other people accuse us for not filing a Contempt of Court petition. They feel that the CAT will punish the officers/government for not honouring the judgements. Let me remind them of our experiences in Pension Anomaly case:

- **The Anomaly occurred in 2002, with effect from October 2000. Service Union took up the matter; discussed for 12 years without any result.**
- **AIBSNLPWA filed the Petition in 2014. CAT gave its judgement in December 2016. DoT did not honour the CAT order.**
- **AIBSNLPWA filed a Contempt of Court petition. Anticipating an Appeal by DoT we filed a caveat petition in HC also.**
- **DoT filed the Appeal in High Court, Delhi in 2017. Delay was condoned by the Court. Delhi High Court dismissed the Appeal in January 2020.**
- **DoT did not honour the HC order too.**

- **Hence we revived the Contempt Petition. CAT disposed Contempt petition in November 2020 giving more time to the Government.**
- **DoT did not issue any order within the stipulated time.**
- **Hence we filed case for ‘contempt to contempt proceedings’ in July 2021. It was taken up on 17th August 2021. DoT which failed to honour the verdict for five years wanted four weeks’ time more to issue order. It was also granted by the Court.**
- **The then Secretary, Telecom who was to retire after ten days delayed the matter by asking unwanted queries. On the last day of his service he returned the file to the Estt Section without giving a decision. The gentleman went scot free. He is enjoying retired life with a central govt. pension.**
- **DoT did not issue order within the time it sought for. Instead, on 20-9-2021, DoT Advocate sought further time for three months. Though our lawyer opposed it vehemently, Tribunal granted time and posted Contempt Petition to 6-11-2021, Nobody was ever punished.**
- **Then a new Secretary took over charge in October 2021. Within a week he issued the order without any difficulty.**
- **Nobody was punished for sitting tight on the files. Court gave time again and again and again. It may be noted that the Supreme Court has refused to grant any immunity to even MPs and MLAs.**



## CHOOSE THOSE WHO CHOOSE YOU

[Extracts from a Note issued by  
Association for Democratic Reforms]

Electoral Bond was introduced by the Finance Minister Mr. Arun Jaitley in the Union Budget 2017-18. It is something like a promissory note, which does not carry the name of the buyer or payee. You can purchase it and then hand over to a political party of your choice. These bonds — issued in multiples of Rs 1000, Rs 10000, Rs 1 lakh, Rs 10 lakh, and Rs 1 crore — should be redeemed within 15 days by the concerned Party through its bank. If not redeemed the amount shall be deposited to the Prime Minister Relief Fund. So far, 146 bonds amounting to a total of Rs 20.28 cr (only 0.275%) were deposited in the PMRF. Thus, 99.725% of the bonds were encashed by the political parties.

### **Many rules and schemes were modified to enable this murky business.**

The Finance Act 2017, which introduced the system of electoral bonds for the purpose of electoral funding, was passed as the Money Bill. The amendments brought through the Act do not require political parties to mention the names and addresses of those contributing by way of electoral bonds in their contribution reports filed with the Election Commission of India annually. This altered the perception around political donations.

Moreover, while electoral bonds provide no details to the citizens, the said anonymity does not apply to the government of the day, which can always take the details from SBI, the only bank authorised to deal the bonds. This

implies that only the tax-payers are in dark about the source of these donations. It may also be noted that the printing of these bonds & SBI commission for facilitating the sale and purchase of the bonds is paid from the taxpayers' money by the central government.

■ Earlier, a Party could not receive donation in cash more than Rs 2000. Now a Party can receive any amount in the form of Bonds.

■ Earlier, details of any donation of more than Rs 20000 had to be furnished to Incometax, Election Commission etc. Electoral Bonds took away that condition.

### **A data analysis says:**

1. A total of 14,363 Electoral Bonds worth Rs 7380.638 cr were sold between March 2018 and July 2021. 14,217 bonds worth Rs 7360.35 cr were redeemed during this period.

2.. 92.30% or Rs 6812 cr of the total value of bonds purchased were in the denomination of Rs 1 crore indicating that these bonds were purchased by corporates, not individuals.

3. 9718 Electoral Bonds worth Rs 5407.07 cr or 73.46% of the total electoral bonds redeemed between March 2018 and July 2021 were encashed in New Delhi (while maximum value of bonds were purchased in Mumbai).

4. Between FY 2017=-18 & 2019-20, recognized political parties received a total of Rs 6,201.53 cr from electoral bonds. A whopping 67.98% or Rs 4,215.89 cr of this was received by a single party which is the ruling political party.



## THE KILLER BONDS

35 pharmaceutical companies in India have contributed nearly Rs 1,000 crore to political parties through electoral bonds, data released by the Election Commission on March 14 has revealed. Some companies were being investigated for poor quality drugs when they purchased the bonds.

### Few cases:

**Hetero:** bought electoral bonds for Rs 60 crore. Maharashtra Food and Drug Administration issued six notices issued to the Hyderabad-based company for substandard drugs. At least three of them pertained to **remdesivir**, an antiviral drug widely used to treat Covid-19, that helped Hetero expand its business during the pandemic. Two other products of Hetero were also found substandard in 2021: an antifungal medicine, **Itbor** capsule, and **Monocef**, used for bacterial infection.

**Torrent Pharma** bought electoral bonds worth Rs 77.5 crore till January 2024. The Gujarat-based company's antiplatelet medicine **Deplatt-150** had failed the salicylic acid test and was declared substandard by the Maharashtra Food and Drug Administration in 2018. In September 2019, Torrent Pharma's drug **Losar H**, used to lower blood pressure, was found to be substandard by the Gujarat Food and Drug Administration. In December 2021, its medicine **Nicoran LV**, used to treat heart

diseases, failed to meet standards when tested by the Maharashtra Food and Drug Administration.

**Zydus Healthcare** purchased electoral bonds worth Rs 29 crore. Bihar drug regulator had declared a batch of **remdesivir** medicines manufactured by the Gujarat-based company as "not of standard quality" after traces of bacterial endotoxin were found in them. Several patients were reported to have suffered adverse drug reactions from the medicines.

**Glenmark** received five notices for its substandard drugs between 2022 and 2023. Four of these were issued by the Maharashtra Food and Drugs Administration, which flagged its blood pressure regulating medicine **Telma** as substandard, mostly failing a dissolution test. The pharmaceutical company purchased Rs 9.75 crore of electoral bonds in November 2022.

**Cipla** received four show-cause notices for its drugs between 2018 and 2022. Since 2019, it has purchased bonds worth Rs 39.2 crore. In August 2018, its **RC cough syrup** failed to meet standards during an inspection. It purchased bonds worth Rs 14 crore the next year. In July 2021, it received notices twice for its **remdesivir** medicine, **Cipremi**. Like Hetero, Cipremi was found to have less than the required quantity of remdesivir in it. Cipla bought bonds worth Rs 25.2 crore in November 2022.

[from a report in Times of India]

# WE SHALL FIGHT WE WILL WIN

DONATIONS RECEIVED  
TOWARDS LEGAL FUND  
TILL 16-4-2024

<b><u>ANDHRA</u></b>		<b><u>HARYANA</u></b>		<b><u>ODISHA</u></b>	
AGS RSN Murthy	25000.00	Gurgaon	7400.00	Balasore	6000.00
Anantapur	100000.00	Rohtak	30000.00	Behrampur	20600.00
Guntur	65000.00			Sambalpur	65101.00
Kurnool	32000.00	<b><u>HIMACHAL</u></b>		<b><u>PUNJAB</u></b>	
Nellore	30000.00	Dharamsala	33600.00	BSNL ROWA	11000.00
Srikakulam	36000.00	Hamirpur	22000.00	<b><u>RAJASTHAN</u></b>	
Vijayawada	50000.00	Shimla	18400.00	Ajmer	20000.00
Visakhapatnam	150000.00	<b><u>JHARKHAND</u></b>		Bharatpur	15050.00
<b><u>BIHAR</u></b>		Jamshedpur	23550.00	<b><u>TAMILNADU</u></b>	
Ara	30000.00	<b><u>KARNATAKA</u></b>		Chennai Tfc	50000.00
Chapra	25000.00	Bangalore	350000.00	Coimbatore	210000.00
Katihar	31000.00	Bellary	25000.00	Cuddalore	30000.00
Motihari	9000.00	Davangere	70000.00	Darmapuri	35000.00
Muzaffarpur	13102.00	Dharwad	100607.00	Erode	34002.00
Patna	45000.00	Kolar	50000.00	Kumbakonam	25000.00
Sasaram	15000.00	Mangalore	150000.00	Madurai	50000.00
W. Champaran	7001.00	Mysore	55000.00	Salem West	125000.00
<b><u>CHENNAI TD</u></b>		Raichur	100000.00	Thanjavur	50000.00
Ambattur	21700.00	Tumkur	100000.00	Trichy	98000.00
Annannagar	15000.00	<b><u>KERALA</u></b>		Virudunagar	25000.00
Kanchipuram	30100.00	Alapuzha	15000.00	<b><u>TELANGANA</u></b>	
Saidapet	11800.00	Calicut	135005.00	AFSRO	10000.00
Villivakkam	66850.00	Ernakulam	150000.00	Mehbubnagar	5000.00
<b><u>DELHI</u></b>		Kollam	27000.00	<b><u>UP WEST</u></b>	
Corp. Office	10000.00	Kottayam	60000.00	Aligarh	22100.00
NTR	10000.00	Malappuram	80000.00	Bareilly	20601.00
<b><u>GUJARAT</u></b>		Palakkad	40000.00	Bijnore	18800.00
Bharuch	7600.00	Trichur	75000.00	Ghaziabad	25501.00
Bhavnagar	51000.00	Trivandrum	25001.00	Mathura	31001.00
Valsad	11400.00	<b><u>MP CIRCLE</u></b>		Noida	8100.00
		Bhopal	30000.00	<b><u>UTTARAKHAND</u></b>	
		Indore	31000.00	Kotdwara	8000.00
		Jabalpur	31600.00	Unidentified	21000.00
		<b><u>MAHARASTRA</u></b>		217 Individuals	154616.00
		Satara	100101.00	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4028289.00</b>

Note: Total amount received up to 16th April 2024 is Rs 40,28,289.00.  
Donations received after 16-4-24 will be published in next issue.

## INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY & BOOK RELEASE

Under the banner of newly formed Mahila sub-committee of AIBSNLPWA, Kerala Circle, a special function was organized at Kottayam on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2024 to celebrate the International Women's Day. (It could not be organized on 8<sup>th</sup> March as the festival Mahashivratri fell on the day this year.) More than 250 women members of AIBSNLPWA from all the SSA Units in Kerala attended the meeting along with other male functionaries of the Association. A booklet in Malayalam, titled 'Anukampa' (meaning compassion), written by Com. P S Ramankutty was released on the occasion. Com. PSR was felicitated by the Kottayam comrades on attaining the age of 80 years. The conference was inaugurated by Smt. Sarada Mohan, Member of Ernakulam Jilla Panchayat and a prominent women's leader in Kerala. Comrades A P Saraswathy (CHQ OS), Annie Preman (Mahila subcommittee Convener), S G Panicker (CHQ VP), R N Pada Nair (CHQ AGS), K Ravindran ( Circle President) and T P George (Circle Secretary) spoke on the occasion. Com. P S Ramankutty talked about the International Women's Day and present social situation of women in our country. He presented the latest position of the pension revision of BSNL/MTNL retirees also.

*[See the photo on last cover page.]*

## SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

**Shri M A Chowdappa, Advisor (Retd), DOT** donated Rs. 5000 to our legal fund.

**Shri Suresh Bhargva, Advisor (Retd), DOT** donated Rs. 5000.

**Shri Ashok Kumar Gupta, CGM (Retd), BSNL** donated Rs. 5000.

**Com. RSN Murthy, our Asst GS from Rajahmundry** sent Rs 25000 as his personal donation.

**Accounts and Financial Service Association, Karnataka Circle** handed over Rs. 50000 to our Legal Fund.

**Accounts and Financial Service Retirees organization, Hyderabad** donated Rs. 10000 to our Legal Fund.

**BSNL Retired Officers' Welfare Association, Amritsar** donated Rs. 11000 to our Legal Fund.

**Similarly, Sri. Suresh Bapat (Indore)** donated Rs 11000. **Com. K R Pillai (Quilon)** **Smt. K Sobha and Sri. Subrahmanyam of Khammam branch** donated Rs 10000 each. **Many members** donated Rs. 5000 each. We shall publish details later.

### CGHS

SOME FIGURES AS ON 10-4 -2024

**Total No. of Card Holders:** 1597122  
**Serving:** 704248 (44%)  
**Pensioners:** 892874 (56%)

**Total No. of Beneficiaries:** 4502950  
**Serving:** 2660263 (59%)  
**Pensioners:** 1842687 (41%)





**K.P.Selvaraj**

*About author: Mr.K.P.Selvaraj, retired as Traffic Manager from VSNL- Chennai (erstwhile Overseas Communication Service) that was later taken up by TATA Communications Ltd.*

## **Migration to SAMPANN, KYP and KYC!**

After the pension migration from bank CPPC to SAMPANN, initially it was a hectic task for many pensioners who weren't aware of the shifting in a phased manner. During the process, except for basic data and pension, all other contact details were either outdated or left blank that resulted in the communication gap about migration. In the nominee details column, either the wife/ husband had no name or the DoB of spouse was a random date. Whatever old data that was available on the bank scroll of pension disbursement was transferred per se.

Until the time for the submission of Life certificate, they least knew that they have been allotted a new 15 digit PPO number and migrated to a regional Telecom circle. Though Aadhar Face Authentication generates Jeevan Pramann using the obsolete 12 digit PPO no., it does not automatically update the Sampann records due to PPO number mismatch. Since LC is successfully generated, the pensioners assume that work is done. After a month they get a reminder to update LC. It is worrying that many senior pensioners are not interested in reading the SMS details they receive as soon as the pension is credited into their bank account. They read the first line about pension credit and skip the rest. Unless shrewd, they do not keep track of the changes happening

in the disbursement process and channel. Once the status is known, they have to call the respective CCA office, furnish mobile number and request them to allot username/ password. Till then they are blindfold. The ignorant family pensioner status is more miserable. Once login details are received, the pensioners should get familiarized with the web portal/App. It is their duty to check and request for an update of all current particulars through SAMPANN grievances window or CPMS portal.

According to a writ petition (No. 405/2023) filed by a pensioner aged 102, under article 226 of the constitution in the Bangalore High Court, the judge observed that if LC is not submitted by the pensioner for some reasons, it is the duty of the respective bank to visit the house of pensioner before stopping the pension. Failing which a fine shall be imposed on respondents for the mental agony caused to the petitioner. Though this judgment is useful, there is a question. What if the petitioner fails to update current address, primary/ secondary mobile numbers, email Id, and nominee details? So it is the responsibility of the pensioner to furnish KYC to the pension disbursing bank / KYP to the office of CCA without fail.

Many senior pensioners are still using the basic phone and they are unable to reap the merits of pension App and email access. I understand that a section of telecom pensioners were migrated at the fag end of the financial year. Based on the new tax

regime, CPPC of banks till then deducted TDS regularly. After migration, even though the normal monthly pension was promptly credited, the pension credit data post migration for remaining months did not reflect in the Form 26AS. The particulars that reflected in Form 26AS had data pertaining only to the pension credit through CPPC and not Sampann. Many would have not noticed or realised that one such lapse had occurred.

This is because, post migration, as per the Sampann pension ledger, the remaining pension credited in that financial year does not entitle for tax liability and hence CGCA does not issue Form 16. Since TDS was not deducted on their side, eventually the balance credit does not appear in Form 26AS also. At the time of filing the return, a pensioner with no income other than bank deposit interest

will not stretch beyond to cross check the data with bank passbook for the reason that everything is accounted and scrupulously reported under PAN. So it is obvious that what is reflected in Form 26AS / Form 16 is taken to be final by the pensioners. By the time they realise in the next assessment year, they cannot add pension credit what was not figured in the tax form except the income from other sources. It is better to seek clarification by registering your grievance on CGCA portal until it is resolved.

Dear Pensioners, please keep abreast of the latest developments and make use of the App/ Portal to check pensioner details, ledger reports, tax deduction, investment declaration, raise grievances and resolve doubts. Let us go digital and make the Sampann initiative a success.

## LEADERS OF THE MOVEMENT

List Of District Level Office Bearers elected recently

<u>District</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Secretary</u>	<u>Treasurer</u>
AP Kurnool	A Ramananjanyulu	J V Ramana	Sudhakara Babu
AP Ongole	R Nageswara Rao	B Brahmananda Reddy	P Tirupathi Swamy
HP Dharamsala	Roshan Lal	Ravikumar Mankotia	Santosh Kumar Gupta
HR Gurgaon	R C Singh	J S Dahiya	K K Piplani
KT Vijayapura	S P Bellubi	S L Kulkarni	S L Hiremath
KL Thamarasseri	M D Joseph	T K Komalan	V V Sivadas
KL Kunnamkulam	K Krishnankutty	N Pradeep	P F Xavier
MP Chindwara	Raghunath Singh Sisodia	Dawande	Devendra Kushwaha
MP Shahdol	Sewaram Chakravarthy	Vijay Kumar Namdeo	Sunder Pandey
MH Chandrapur	Wasudeo Askar	Ramanand Singh	Devrao C. Bawane
MH Latur	D M Dange	D G Kulkarni	D K Waghmare
OR Sambalpur	Andandachandra Pande	Nirmalchandra Pradhan	Pradesi Kisan
PB Sangrur	D P Dardi	S Sukhvir Singh	Not received
RJ Ajmer	S C Chourasia	J C Airan	J P Gunesar
RJ SawaiMadhopur	Ajay Kr Arya	Sugan Chand Jain	N L Gupta
TG Mahabubnagar	M Shankar Rao	K Rajarathnam	G Balaswamy
UPE Ayodhya	Ram Laut	V P Pandey	Kanhaiya Lal
UPW Meerut	D D Singh	R D Ram	Vijay Kumar Sharma
WB Siliguri	S N Prasad	S P Singh	A K Pandit

# AIBSNLPWA ACTIVITIES



Meerut District Conference



Vellore District GB Meeting



Punjab CEC Meeting on 7-3-2024



# PENSIONERS PATRIKA

MAY - JUNE, 2024

Published  
Bimonthly.

RNI Regn No. TNBIL/2017/70652

Posted in first week  
of alternate month

## INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY



A view of audience attending the special function at Kottayam (Kerala) on 9-3-2024. [Report on Page 28]



IWD CELEBRATION BY STR Branch on 15-3-2024