सत्यमेव जयते
न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन
COURT OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES(DIVYANGJAN)
दिव्यांगजन सशक्तिकरण विभाग/Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan)
सामाजिक न्याय और अधिकारिता मंत्रालय/Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment
भारत सरकार/Government of India
5वाँ तल, एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन, जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075; दूरभाष : (011)20892364
5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccpd.nic.in

Case No. CCPD/14189/1024/2023

In the matter of —

Shri Abdul Wahid **…Complainant**

Versus

(1) The Dy. CDA (P)
Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (pensions),
Prayagraj

(2) The General Manager,
Ordinance Factory
Dehradun **…Respondents**

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Shri Abdul Wahid, a person with 77% locomotor disability, filed a complaint dated 11.05.2022 regarding the alleged delay in issuance of a revised Pension Payment Order (PPO).

1.2 The Complainant retired from service on 12.12.2003 pursuant to compulsory retirement. According to the complaint, following the directions of the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad, subsequently upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand, the period of his suspension was counted as qualifying service. Consequently, his pension was revised, fixing his basic pension at ₹7,215 under the Sixth Central Pay Commission and ₹18,543 under the Seventh Central Pay Commission.

1.3 The Complainant alleged that, despite the passage of considerable time,

the revised PPO had not been issued. He submitted that, upon approaching the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj, he was informed that the requisite documents had not been received from the Ordnance Factory, whereas the Ordnance Factory maintained that the documents had already been forwarded. The Complainant further stated that he had lodged several complaints through the departmental grievance mechanism and the Public Grievance Portal and had also sought information under the Right to Information mechanism. He alleged that the delay had deprived him of the benefits associated with the revision of his pension and caused him financial hardship. Accordingly, he sought intervention for resolution of his grievance.

2. Notice to the Respondents :

2.1 Notice was issued on 26.07.2023 to the Respondents seeking their comments on the complaint and the alleged delay in issuance of the revised PPO.

3. Reply made by the Respondent:

3.1 The Respondents, in their reply dated 05.09.2023, submitted that the amended PPO bearing No. 40120040405883 had been issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj, on 01.06.2023 and had subsequently been forwarded to the Complainant through a letter dated 12.07.2023 issued by the Ordnance Factory, Dehradun.

The Respondents submitted that, in view of the issuance and forwarding of the amended PPO, the original grievance stood resolved and requested that the complaint be disposed of.

4. Rejoinder by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant field his rejoinder dated 21.09.2023 and re-determination of his pension and payment of arrears, including delay penalties, from 13.12.2003. He requested verification of all related documents, including his service records, previous correspondence with Ordnance Factory Dehradun and PCDA (Pension) Allahabad, and noted discrepancies and delays in issuance of his original and revised PPOs. He highlighted that all necessary evidence and details were provided by him, yet errors and incomplete entries persisted, causing him financial and mental hardship for over a year. He requested that a revised PPO reflecting his full service period

of 17 years and 8 months, along with increased pension and arrears in accordance with the 5th, 6th, and 7th Pay Commission orders, be issued promptly.

5. Hearing:

5.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 11.12.2025 and the following parties/ representatives were present:

S. No.	Name and designation of the Attendees	On behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Abdul Wahid	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Puneet Sinha- Dy. GM-Ordnance Factory Dehradun	Respondent	Online
3.	Mr. S.M Maurya- Sr. Accounts Officer.	Respondent	Online
4.	Mr. Sujeet Kumar- Assistant Account Officer	Respondent	Online

5.2 During the hearing, the Complainant submitted that, although his pension had been sanctioned, the annual increment allegedly due to him prior to his retirement had not been granted. He contended that the non-grant of the increment had affected the fixation of his pension and requested that the admissible benefit be extended to him.

5.3 The representative of the Ordnance Factory, Dehradun, submitted that the issue concerning the grant of the annual increment had not formed part of the original complaint and had not been examined earlier. It was further submitted that the directions issued by the competent authority or Court had been implemented and that no representation seeking the grant of the increment had been received from the Complainant. The representative assured that, upon receipt of a formal representation through the prescribed channel, the claim would be examined in accordance with the applicable rules.

5.4 The representative of the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj, submitted that the pension had been processed on the basis of the PPO. It was further stated that the Complainant would be informed of any additional documents or particulars required for examination of his claim concerning the annual increment and consequential revision of pensionary benefits.

5.5 This Court considered the submissions made by the parties during the hearing. The grievance originally brought before this Court concerned the delay in issuance of a revised PPO following the counting of the suspension period as qualifying service. The Respondents have submitted that the amended PPO was issued and forwarded to the Complainant. The subsequent claim concerning the grant of an annual increment was raised during the hearing. As recorded in the submissions of the Respondents, the claim had not previously been examined by the competent authority. The question of admissibility of the annual increment and its consequential effect on pension requires examination with reference to the applicable service and pension rules, the relevant service records and the judicial pronouncements governing the Complainant's service and retirement.

5.6. Accordingly, the claim concerning the annual increment is considered appropriate for examination by the competent authority in the first instance. No finding is being recorded in these proceedings regarding the Complainant's substantive entitlement to the increment.

6. Observations and Recommendations

6.1 The principal grievance concerning the delay in issuance of the revised PPO appears to have been addressed, in view of the Respondents' submission that the amended PPO was issued on 01.06.2023 and forwarded to the Complainant through a letter dated 12.07.2023. However, the issuance of the amended PPO, by itself, does not establish whether the Complainant has received the PPO or whether all consequential benefits claimed by him have been released. The status of receipt and any outstanding consequential payments shall be verified from the relevant records.

6.2 With regard to the claim concerning the annual increment, the Complainant is advised to submit a detailed representation to the competent authority through the prescribed channel, along with the relevant supporting documents, including the particulars of his service, retirement and pension fixation. A copy of the representation may also be furnished to the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj, and this Court for information.

6.3 The competent authority is recommended to examine the representation on its merits in accordance with the applicable service and pension rules, relevant judicial pronouncements and applicable Government instructions. If any document, clarification or additional information is required, the same may

be communicated to the Complainant promptly so that the claim can be examined without avoidable procedural delay. A reasoned decision may thereafter be communicated to the Complainant expeditiously, preferably within fifteen days of receipt of the complete representation, subject to the applicable rules and availability of the requisite records.

6.4 The Respondents are advised to ensure that the Complainant's claim is examined fairly and in accordance with the applicable legal and administrative framework. The applicability of the relevant provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, including Section 20, shall be considered in the light of the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of the alleged deprivation of rights.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 04-11-2026
14:31:26

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities