

16.06.2020. The respondent in compliance to Hon'ble Court's order, considered the representation afresh and disposed of the same by observing that as per Medical Board, although the applicant is 60% visually impaired is able to earn his livelihood. Besides this, it also appears that the applicant is the owner of one bigha and six cottahs of agricultural land in his native place, Salar, Murshidabad.

After hearing the parties and considering the submissions, I am of the view that the rejection of his representation for family pension both by the Tribunal in OA-65 of 2021 and the respondents has merit. It is apparent that, although the applicant is 60 % visually impaired but is also owner of an agricultural land of one bigha and six cottah which is sufficient to take care of his livelihood.

The respondent was also reasonable in turning down the representation because in the pension rules, there is no provision for sanction of family pension to an adult son, nearly 50 years. Hence no order is passed. Accordingly, the OA is disposed of.

SAYEED AHMED BABA
MEMBER (A)

sc