

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL
BENCH AT NAINITAL**

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Rajendra Singh

.....Vice Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Mr. A.S.Rawat

.....Vice Chairman(A)

CLAIM PETITION NO. 99/NB/DB/2023

Ved Prakash (Male), aged about 62 years, S/o Late Puran Prasad, R/o House No. 778 Shahbad Bhoor, Bareilly, P.O. Bareilly, Tehsil and District Bareilly.

-----Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Uttarakhand through Secretary School Education, Civil Secretariat, Dehradun.
2. Director of Secondary Education, Uttarakhand Government Nanoorkheda, Dehradun.
3. Additional Director of Education, (Secondary Education), Kumaon Division, Nainital.
4. Director, Treasury, Pension and Entitlement, Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
5. Chief Education Officer, Rudrapur, Udham Singh Nagar.
6. Chief Treasury Officer, Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar.

-----Respondents

Present: Sri S.K.Mandal, Advocate for the petitioner
Sri Kishore Kumar, A.P.O., for the respondents

JUDGMENT

DATED: SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

PER: SRI A.S.RAWAT, VICE CHAIRMAN(A)

By means of present claim petition, the petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

“ i) To command the respondents for re-determine and pay the post retirement dues such as arrears of gratuity and commutation, with interest, after calculating entire service

rendered by the petitioner w.e.f. 01.11.2004 to 31.03.2021, till the date of his superannuation.

ii) To command the respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioner after calculating the entire service from 01.11.2004 to 31.03.2021 and also pay the amount sum of rupees 1,14,702/- which has been illegally deducted by the respondent.

iii) To pass an order or direction in the nature, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

iv) Award the cost of the claim petition and may be given to the petitioner.”

2. Brief facts of the case are as follows:

2.1 The petitioner was appointed as Shiksha Bandhu by the order of the District Education Officer, by letter no. 1619/92/04-05 dated 25.10.2004 on the substantive post of Lecturer (Hindi) with the contract and he was given the charge on 01.11.2004 by the Principal, Government Inter College, Jaurasi, District Almora. On 25.07.2006, the Additional Director of Education, School Education, Dehradun vide his letter no. 431/2006-07 dated 25.07.2006 appointed the petitioner on the post of Lecturer (Hindi) with a pay scale of Rs. 6500-10500 as ad-hoc against the substantive vacant post. The petitioner took the charge on 01.08.2006. On 17.05.2014, the Director of Education passed the order and services of the petitioner has been regularized and confirmed on the post of Lecturer, Hindi. In pursuance of the notification no. 1298/XXX(2) 2013-3(1)/2008 dated 30.12.2013 and the Regularization Rule 2013. The petitioner was granted selection grade vide order dated 12.08.2017 by the Additional Director of Education (Secondary Education) Kumaon Division, Nainital. After completion of 10 years satisfactory service in the Pay Scale of Rs. 56,100-17,7500, Level-10, in which the period of ad-hoc appointment from 01.08.2006 to 17.05.2014 was taken into account the regular service and the selection grade was granted from 01.08.2016.

2.2 The petitioner retired from the post of Lecturer Hindi from G.I.C. Haripura Harsan, District Udham Singh Nagar after attaining

the age of superannuation on 31.12.2020 and he was given the benefit of end of Session till 31.03.2021, therefore, he retired on 31.03.2021. On 29.09.2021, the Additional Director, has sent the pension/ gratuity/ pension commutation/family pension payment order forwarding letter, in which only Rs. 2,78,343/- was granted and there is no gratuity, out of which the amount Rs. 1,14,702/- was recovered and only Rs. 1,63,641/- was paid and there is no commutation amount and other retirement dues paid to the petitioner. According to the new pension scheme, in which the name of the petitioner has been registered on 03.12.2015, the total Rs. 14,24,384/- is showing in the account of the petitioner, in which the petitioner has contributed Rs. 10,73,920/-. After retirement, the petitioner has received only Rs.1,63,641/- and the respondent has recovered the amount Rs. 1,14,702/- without assigning any reason.

2.3 The petitioner has made several representations to the Director of Treasury, Pension and Entitlement, Uttarakhand, Dehradun requesting that the amount deposited in the NPS as well as the pension may be granted as he has no other source of livelihood after retirement. On 29.09.2022, the Director of School Education, Uttarakhand sent letter to all the Chief Education Officer stating therein that there are number of complaints being made for non-payment of retirement dues to the employees and teachers, therefore, all the disputes shall be decided within one month. Thereafter, no amount has been released to the petitioner and the amount lying under the new pension scheme also withheld by the respondents.

2.4 The petitioner has made 59 contributions as on November 2022 in the New Pension Scheme and the value of the fund of the petitioner is more than Rs. 14 Lacs and same has not been released till the date after his retirement. The National Pension Scheme has been introduced (contributory pension scheme) from 01/10/2005 in Uttarakhand by the Govt. of Uttarakhand. The petitioner has continuously worked without any artificial break on the post of Lecturer from 01.11.2004 to 31.03.2021, which is about 16 years 5 months.

The entire service period has to be considered for the calculation of retirement dues, pension and gratuity, but the respondents illegally withheld, which is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

2.5 In the similar circumstances, a writ petition no. 3669 of 2018 (WPSS) was filed before the Hon'ble High Court. On 29.07.2019, the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to allow this writ petition with the direction that the ad-hoc period of service shall be counted for determination of service, which is violative of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The State Government filed the Special Appeal No. 100 of 2020, State of Uttarakhand and others Vs. Vijendra Pal Dwivedi against the judgment and order dated 29.07.2019. Hon'ble High Court, on 04.08.2020, dismissed the special appeal and confirmed the judgment dated 29.07.2019. In other similar writ petition no. 2436 of 2019 (S/S), Lalit Mohan Pandey Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, WPSS 2434 of 2019, Roop Narayan Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others and WPSS 2437 of 2019, Tribhuwan Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, the Hon'ble High Court also concurred the judgment and order dated 29.07.2019 and directed to count the service rendered by them on ad-hoc basis and respondents shall also pay all consequential benefit after re-fixation of their pension vide the judgment and order dated 27.09.2019. In the similar circumstances the Division Bench of this Tribunal passed the judgment and order on 01-11-2022 in the claim petition no. 102/NB/DB/2022, Rajvir Singh Yadav vs. State of Uttarakhand and others in which, this Tribunal has directed the department to re-fix the retiral dues after counting the past service and shall pay the same in way the various judgments and orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court.

2.6 The deduction of the gratuity, pension and retirement dues of the petitioner after excluding the period of temporary, ad-hoc from 01.11.2004 to 17.05.2014 is illegal and the continuous temporary, ad-hoc service is liable to be calculated as per the judgment and order passed by this Hon'ble High Court and by the Hon'ble Apex Court and the petitioner is also entitled to get the gratuity and pension of service

for the period of 16 years 5 months in proportionate. By not paying the pension, gratuity and other fund as well as the deduction of Rs. 1,14,702/-without assigning any reason is illegal, against the provision of law and the judgment and order passed by this Court. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to get the entire benefit of service including the temporary, ad-hoc service period and also entitled to get the retirement benefit; pension and gratuity, and same is liable to be paid by the respondents with admissible interest.

2.7 According to the new pension scheme, the 60% payment from the contribution of the petitioner has to be paid immediately and from remaining 40% of the fund, the pension has to be calculated. The gratuity of entire service has to be paid by the respondent department with interest in according to the law. The petitioner earlier filed the writ petition no 683 of 2023 (S/S) Ved Prakash v/s State of Uttarakhand and other and the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand dismissed the same on 04-05-2023 and ordered to file the claim petition before this Tribunal.

3. C.A./W.S. has also been filed on behalf of the respondents refuting the contentions made in the claim petition and it has been stated that-

3.1 जिला शिक्षा अधिकारी अल्मोड़ा के कार्यालय पत्र दिनांक 1619 दिनांक 25-10-2004 द्वारा याची की नियुक्ति शिक्षा बन्धु प्रवक्ता (हिन्दी) के पद पर राजकीय इण्टर कालेज जौरासी, अल्मोड़ा में हुई। प्रधानाचार्य राजकीय इण्टर कालेज जौरासी, अल्मोड़ा के पत्रांक 232 दिनांक 06 नवम्बर 2004 द्वारा याची को दिनांक 01-11-2004 को विद्यालय में कार्यभार ग्रहण कराया गया। कार्यालय निदेशक विद्यालयी शिक्षा उत्तरांचल, मयूर विहार, देहरादून के आदेश संख्या-431 दिनांक 25 जुलाई 2006 द्वारा याची को शिक्षा बन्धु के रूप में कार्यरत पद पर तदर्थ नियुक्ति प्रदान की गई। कार्यालय प्रधानाचार्य राजकीय इण्टर कालेज जौरासी (अल्मोड़ा) के आदेश संख्या-04 दिनांक 01 अगस्त 2006 द्वारा याची को तदर्थ नियुक्ति प्रवक्ता हिन्दी के पद पर दिनांक 01-08-2006 को कार्यभार ग्रहण कराया गया। कार्यालय निदेशक माध्यमिक शिक्षा उत्तराखण्ड ननूरखेड़ा देहरादून के कार्यालय आदेश सं0-159 दिनांक 17 मई 2014 द्वारा याची का विनियमितीकरण किया गया। कार्यालय मण्डलीय अपर निदेशक (मा०शि०) कुमायूँ मण्डल नैनीताल के कार्यालयी आदेश

संख्या/304 दिनांक 22 अगस्त 2017 द्वारा याची को दिनांक 01-08-2016 से चयन वेतन स्वीकृत किया गया। कार्यालय प्रधानाचार्य राजकीय इण्टर कालेज हरिपुर हरसान बाजपुर (ऊधम सिंह नगर) के आदेश 03 दिनांक 31 मार्च 2021 द्वारा याची को अधिवर्षता तिथि 31 दिसम्बर 2020 व सत्रांत लाभ तिथि 31 मार्च 2021 को पूर्ण हो जाने के फलस्वरूप दिनांक 31-03-2021 की अपरान्ह में सेवानिवृत्त कर कार्यमुक्त किया गया।

3.2 याची श्री वेद प्रकाश को सेवानिवृत्ति के उपरान्त जी०आई०एस० (सामूहिक बीमा), उपार्जित अवकाश नकदीकरण, ग्रेज्यूटी एवं एन०पी०एस० की धनराशि का भुगतान किया जा चुका है व उत्तराखण्ड सेवानिवृत्ति लाभ अधिनियम, 2018 के भाग-एक, प्रस्तर-1 (2) के अनुसार याची को विनियमितिकरण से पूर्व तदर्थ की सेवाओं की अवधि में पेंशन देय नहीं है। याची को अंशदायी पेंशन खाता संख्या-BHK/CPSN-20080 के आधार पर प्रान संख्या-110010973079 आवंटित किया गया था। उक्त खाता संख्या वर्ष 2008-09 में रु० 18824/- व वर्ष 2009-10 में रु० 59402/-रु० कुल 78226/-रु० की धनराशि जमा हुई थी। तत्पश्चात् उक्त खाते में धनराशि की कटौती बन्द हो गई। माह फरवरी 2016 से श्री वेद प्रकाश को एलाट नये प्रान न०-110036825302 मे पुनः धनराशि कटौती प्रारम्भ की गई। याची को सेवानिवृत्ति के उपरान्त निम्न मदानुसार भुगतान किये गये है-

1. प्रधानाचार्य रा०इ०का० हरिपुरा हरसान, बाजपुर, ऊधम सिंह नगर के कार्यालय पत्रांक/109-113 दिनांक 13.09.2023 के द्वारा प्रतिवादी सं०-05 को प्रेषित पत्र में उल्लेखित किया गया है कि निम्नानुसार याची को अन्य सेवानिवृत्तिक देयकों का भुगतान कर दिया गया है।

- i. जी०आई०एस० (सामूहिक बीमा) धनराशि रु० 33966/- का भुगतान दिनांक 27-06-2021 को किया गया।
- ii. उपार्जित अवकाश (ई०एल०) नकदीकरण की धनराशि रु० 39967/- का भुगतान दिनांक 27-06-2021 को किया गया।
- iii. उपार्जित अवकाश (ई०एल०) पर डी०ए०-17 प्रतिशत व 28 प्रतिशत का अन्तर भुगतान रु० 2351/- का किया गया।
- iv. याची श्री वेद प्रकाश को चयन वेतनमान देय के समय त्रुटिपूर्ण वेतन निर्धारण के कारण एक अतिरिक्त वेतनवृद्धि प्रदान की गई थी, जिस कारण याची को धनराशि 114702/- का अतिरिक्त भुगतान हो जाने के कारण याची के ग्रेज्यूटी भुगतान धनराशि-278343/-से धनराशि 114702/- की वसूली की गई, तथा धनराशि 163641/-का भुगतान याची को किया गया।

2. प्रधानाचार्य रा०३०का० हरिपुरा हरसान, बाजपुर, ऊधम सिंह नगर के कार्यालय पत्रांक/27-29/एन०पी०एस०/भुगतान/2025-26 दिनांक 05.05.2025 के द्वारा प्रतिवादी सं०-05 को पत्र प्रेषित कर अवगत कराया गया है कि निदेशालय कोषागार पेंशन एवं हकदारी उत्तराखण्ड डालनवाला देहरादून के आदेश पत्रांक/2867/नि०को०/रा०पे०यो०/(2)/2024 दिनांक 16.10.2024 तथा पत्रांक/3581/नि०को०/रा०पे० यो०/(2)/2024 दिनांक 29.11.2023 के अनुपालन में प्राप्त निर्देशानुसार तीन चरणों में श्री वेद प्रकाश शर्मा, से०नि० प्रवक्ता के प्रान सं०-110036825302 में जमा धनराशि रू० 896131.00 (रूपये आठ लाख छियानबे हजार एक सौ इकत्तीस मात्र) का भुगतान याची के बैंक खाते में एन०पी०एस० ऑनलाईन एकनालेजमेंट संख्या -201139766401 के माध्यम से दिनांक 14 नवम्बर 2024 को मुख्य कोषागार ऊधम सिंह नगर द्वारा कर दिया गया है तथा प्रान सं०-110036825302 में जमा धनराशि रू० 598762.27 (पाँच लाख अठानबे हजार सात सौ बाईस रूपये एवं सत्ताईस पैसा मात्र) का पूर्ण भुगतान एन०पी०एस० ऑनलाईन एकनालेजमेंट संख्या -201139766402 के माध्यम से दिनांक 25 नवम्बर 2024 को मुख्य कोषागार ऊधम सिंह नगर द्वारा कर दिया गया है। साथ ही माह सितम्बर 2008 से माह फरवरी 2010 तक में हुई त्रुटिपूर्ण एन०पी०एस० अंशदान कटौती की निदेशालय कोषागार पेंशन एवं हकदारी उत्तराखण्ड डालनवाला देहरादून द्वारा स्वीकृत धनराशि रू० 39113.00 (रूपये उन्तालीस हजार एक सौ तेरह मात्र) के रिफंड का भुगतान कोषागार वाउचर संख्या-B83420002 दिनांक 03 जनवरी 2025 के द्वारा सम्बन्धित के खाते में कर दिया गया है। वर्तमान में याची का केवल यात्रा स्थानान्तरण भत्ता देयक की धनराशि रू० 13916.00 का भुगतान बिल कालातीत हो जाने के कारण नहीं हो पाया है, जिसे निदेशालय, माध्यमिक शिक्षा, उत्तराखण्ड, देहरादून से पुर्नजीवित कराकर बजट मांग स्वीकृति हेतु पत्र प्रेषित किया गया है।

उत्तराखण्ड सेवानिवृत्ति लाभ अधिनियम, 2018 के भाग-एक, प्रस्तर-1 (2) में स्पष्ट है कि दिनांक 01 अक्टूबर 2005 से पूर्व राज्याधीन सेवाओं के अधीन मौलिक रूप से नियुक्त कार्मिकों पर उनकी अधिवर्षता आयु पूर्ण करने, स्वैच्छिक सेवानिवृत्ति एवं अनिवार्य सेवानिवृत्ति की दशा में लागू होगा तथा कार्मिक की मृत्यु की दशा में ऐसे कार्मिकों के आश्रितों पर लागू होगा, परन्तु यह कि दिनांक 01.10.2005 से मौलिक रूप से नियुक्त कार्मिक नई अंशदान पेशन योजना से शासित होंगे परन्तु यह और कि ऐसे कार्मिक की सेवा जो-(ख) संविदा, कार्य-प्रभारित, अंशकालिक, दैनिक वेतन, तदर्थ व नियत वेतन में की गयी सेवा (ग) अधिवर्षता आयु पूर्ण करने के पश्चात सेवा विस्तार/पुनर्नियोजित/सत्रान्त लाभ के रूप में की गयी सेवा, उपरोक्त खण्ड (क) से (छ) तक उल्लिखित सेवाओं के लिए पेंशन अनुमन्य नहीं होगी। उत्तराखण्ड सेवानिवृत्ति लाभ अधिनियम, 2018 के भाग-एक, प्रस्तर-1(2) के

अनुसार याची को विनियमितिकरण से पूर्व तदर्थ की सेवाओं की अवधि में पेंशन देय नहीं है।

3.3 याचिकाकर्ता के द्वारा योजित की गयी वर्तमान याचिका असत्य एवं भ्रामक तथ्यों पर आधारित है, जिस कारण उक्त याचिका खारिज होने योग्य है।

4. R.A. has also been filed on behalf of the petitioner denying the contentions made in the Counter Affidavit and has reiterated the averments made in the claim petition.

5. We have heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has worked from 01/11/ 2004 as Shiksha Bandhu on the substantive post of the lecturer (Hindi) on contract basis and thereafter w.e.f. 01/8/2006 on ad hoc basis as the lecturer (Hindi). He has been regularized as the lecturer w.e.f. 17/05/2014. He has retired from the service on 31/03/2021. In the meantime, he was granted selection grade on 01/8/2016 which was given to him by counting the 10 years' service from 01/8/2006. He has been paid the pension as per New Pension Scheme and gratuity amount of Rs 1, 63, 641/- only after recovering Rs 1,14, 702. The learned counsel for the petitioner further argued that the petitioner has rendered service on ad hoc and contractual basis before his regularization on 17/5/2014 and this period along with the period after regularization should be considered for Old Pension Scheme. Accordingly, he should be paid gratuity also. He relied on following judgements of the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital and the Uttarakhand Public Service Tribunal in support of his claim for considering the service rendered w.e.f. 01/11/2004 to 16/5/2014 before his regularization:

- i. *Judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital dated 29/07/2019 in Writ petition no. 3669 of 2018 (WPSS) 2020, Vijendra Pal Dwivedi Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others and judgement dated 04.08.2020, in the Special Appeal No. 100 of 2020 above judgment and order dated 29.07.2019.*

ii. Judgement dated 29/07/2019 concurred by the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital in the other similar writ petition no. 2436 of 2019 (S/S), Lalit Mohan Pandey Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, WPSS 2434 of 2019, Roop Narayan Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others and WPSS 2437 of 2019, Tribhuwan Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others.

iii. Judgment and order on 1-11-2022, in claim petition no. 102/NB/DB/2022, Rajvir Singh Yadav vs. State of Uttarakhand and others by the Division Bench of Uttarakhand Public Services Tribunal.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that to pay amount of Rs 114702/-which has been recovered from the gratuity amount of the petitioner. The petitioner has not misrepresented for payment of this amount to him. The relief sought by the petitioner is covered under the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334.

7. Learned A.P.O. argued that the petitioner has been regularized on 17.05.2014. He is entitled to the pension under New Pension Scheme which has been implemented from 1/10/2005. The matter related to counting service before regularization of petitioner is not covered under Uttarakhand Government Retirement Benefit Rules, 2018. He is not entitled to get the benefit of the Old Pension Scheme, as per his argument that he has rendered service before his regularization. The amount of Rs 1,14,702/- which has been recovered from the gratuity amount is the excess amount paid to him due to error in fixation of the pay of the petitioner at the time of granting him selection grade. So, the Claim petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. Based on the arguments of the parties and the records place before the Tribunal we find that the petitioner was regularized as the lecturer on 17.05.2014. He has worked as Shiksha Bandhu from 01.11.2004 to 31.07.2006 on Contract basis and from 01.08.2006 to 16.05.2014 on ad-hoc basis before his regularization. His request for bringing him under Old Pension Scheme from New Pension Scheme by counting service from 01.11.2004 to 31.03.2021 is not tenable as

he was regularized as the lecturer on 17.05.2014 and New Pension scheme was made applicable in the state from 01.10.2005. The judgements of the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital and this Tribunal relied upon by the Learned Counsel for the petitioner are related to giving benefit of the qualifying service rendered before regularization for pensionary benefits. Since the petitioner has worked as lecturer on ad hoc basis w.e.f. 01.08.2006 to 16.05.2014, this period can be considered for payment of pensionary benefit i.e. gratuity only.

9. It is the submission of learned Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is entitled to get the amount of Rs 1,14,702 /-which has been recovered from his gratuity amount as the petitioner has not misrepresented for payment of this amount to him. The issue was settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015) 4 SCC 334. Based on the decision rendered by Hon'ble Apex Court in Syed Abdul Qadir vs. State of Bihar, (2009) 3 SCC 475 and hosts of other decisions, which were cited therein including B.J. Akkara vs. Union of India, (2006) 11 SCC 709, the Hon'ble Apex Court concluded thus:

"18. It is not possible to postulate all situations of hardship, which would govern employees on the issue of recovery, where payments have mistakenly been made by the employer, in excess of their entitlement. Be that as it may, based on the decisions referred to herein above, we may, as a ready reference, summarise the following few situations, wherein recoveries by the employers, would be impermissible in law:

- (i) Recovery from employees belonging to Class-III and Class-IV service (or Group 'C' and Group 'D' service).*
- (ii) Recovery from retired employees, or employees who are due to retire within one year, of the order of recovery.*
- (iii) Recovery from employees, when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.*
- (iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post, and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.*
- (v) In any other case, where the Court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employee, would be iniquitous*

or harsh or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover."

[Emphasis supplied]

10. In view of the above facts and the judgements of the Hon'ble Courts, it is clear that the petitioner is a retired employee and recovery made from him would be iniquitous or harsh to such an extent that it would far outweigh the equitable balance of employers' right to recover. This case is covered under the guidelines laid down by the judgement of Hon'ble Apex Court in State of Punjab vs. Rafiq Masih, (2015). The petitioner is entitled to be refunded the amount of Rs 1,14,702/- recovered from the gratuity as the petitioner is a retired Government employee and no case of misrepresentation has been brought against him. Hence, the claim petition is liable to be partly allowed.

ORDER

The claim petition is partly allowed to the extent that the respondents are directed to give benefit of the service rendered from 01.08.2006 to 16.05.2014 on ad-hoc basis for calculation of gratuity only. The respondents are further directed to refund the amount of Rs 1,14,702/- to the petitioner, which has been recovered from his gratuity amount. The respondents are also directed to recalculate the gratuity amount and pay the difference of arrears to the petitioner within two months of presentation of certified copy of this judgement. No order as to costs.

RAJENDRA SINGH
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

A.S.RAWAT
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

DATED: SEPTEMBER 30, 2025
DEHRADUN
KNP