

SUMMARY OF THE JUDGMENT

This document is a legal judgment concerning the entitlement of retired telecom employees and pensioners to pension revisions based on the recommendations of the 7th Central Pay Commission.

Overview of Pension Revision Dispute for Absorbed Telecom Employees

A legal dispute concerns whether retired employees absorbed into BSNL/MTNL are entitled to pension revisions based on the 7th CPC, with the core issue revolving around the applicability of Central Government pension rules versus PRC guidelines for PSUs.

Legal Challenge Against Tribunal Order

The case challenges the Central Administrative Tribunal's order directing pension revisions in line with Central Government standards.

- The Tribunal allowed three OAs, mandating pension revision for respondents as per CPC recommendations.
- The petitioners, Union of India, filed writ petitions against this order.
- The Tribunal's decision was based on the premise that absorbed employees were governed by Rule 37A and entitled to parity with Central Government pensioners.
- The petitioners argue that Rule 37A limits pension revision rights to the formula at the time of retirement, not subsequent revisions.
- The legal question is whether absorbed employees can claim pension revision under the 7th CPC based on parity.

•

Background of Employee Absorption and Pension Rules

Details of the transfer, absorption, and applicable pension rules for employees absorbed into BSNL/MTNL.

- Employees transferred en masse from DoT to BSNL/MTNL from 01.01.2000, with options for absorption or reversion.
- Rule 37A, inserted on 30.09.2000, governs pension for absorbed employees, linking it to the formula applicable at retirement.
- Absorbed employees cease to be government servants upon absorption; their post is abolished.
- Pension benefits are to be paid by the government, with contributions to a pension fund by PSUs.
- Employees were assured that their service conditions, including pension rules, would remain unchanged post-absorption.

- The pay scales shifted from CDA to IDA, with IDA being more lucrative, influencing pension calculations.

•

Dispute Over Applicability of CPC Revisions

Core issue whether CPC recommendations for pay and pension revisions apply to PSU employees absorbed into BSNL/MTNL.

- Central Government employees' pensions are revised every 10 years via CPC; PSUs follow PRC.
- The 6th CPC revision in 2006 and the 7th CPC revision in 2016 impacted Central employees' pensions.
- The respondents' last pension revision was in 2007 under the 6th CPC.
- The respondents claim entitlement to 7th CPC revision based on parity and assurances, while petitioners argue Rule 37A limits revisions to the formula at retirement.
- The petitioners contend that PSUs are governed by PRC, and CPC recommendations do not automatically extend to them.
- The Tribunal's order was based on the premise that pension revision should be extended to respondents as per Central Government standards.

•

Arguments Presented by Petitioners

Petitioners' legal and factual arguments against pension revision claims.

- The respondents' pension is governed by Rule 37A, which limits revision rights to the formula at the time of retirement.
- CPC recommendations are applicable only to Central Government employees, not PSUs.
- The IDA pay scale and formula differ from CDA, and pension revision under CPC is not automatically applicable.
- Absorbed employees opted for IDA scale, which is governed by PRC, not CPC.
- The circulars and OM documents emphasize that absorption into PSUs shifts governance from government rules to PSU rules.
- The financial health of BSNL/MTNL prevents implementation of 3rd PRC recommendations, affecting pension revision.
- Applying CPC revision to IDA scale employees would lead to significant financial liabilities (over Rs. 16,938 crores).

•

Arguments Presented by Respondents

Respondents' claims based on assurances, legal provisions, and previous orders.

- The respondents were assured their service conditions, including pension rules, would remain unchanged post-absorption.
- Rule 37A and various OM documents explicitly state that absorbed employees are entitled to the same pension scheme as Central Government employees.
- Pension revisions were granted under 6th CPC in 2007 and extended benefits like DCRG, commutation, etc.
- The 7th CPC recommendations, including the 2.57 multiplier, should be applied to their pensions based on parity.
- Circulars and orders from the Department of Pension & PW support their entitlement.
- The Tribunal's reliance on the order that absorbed employees cease to be government servants is challenged, emphasizing the assurances and legal promises made.
- The respondents argue that the legal and administrative framework supports their claim for pension revision under the 7th CPC.

•

Key Legal and Judicial Precedents

Precedents and judicial orders relevant to pension revision rights of absorbed employees.

- Several CAT orders and High Court judgments have addressed similar issues, with some favoring pension revision based on parity.
- The Kerala High Court's order (2025) was withdrawn, and the respondents clarified they do not rely on it.
- Past decisions show a split, with some courts recognizing the entitlement to CPC-based revision, others emphasizing the limits of Rule 37A.
- The Supreme Court's judgments in related cases highlight the importance of contractual promises and administrative assurances.
- The legal debate centers on whether absorption and Rule 37A restrict subsequent pension revision rights or whether assurances override these restrictions.

•

Financial Implications and Policy Considerations

The potential financial impact of granting pension revisions based on CPC recommendations.

- Granting the respondents' claims could cost the government over Rs. 16,938 crores.
- The financial health of BSNL/MTNL is a key factor in the non-implementation of 3rd PRC recommendations.
- The government argues that extending CPC revisions to IDA scale employees would set a precedent affecting fiscal stability.
- The petitioners emphasize that pension revision rights are limited by the legal framework and the financial viability of PSUs.
- The respondents argue that pension rights are protected by assurances and legal obligations, regardless of PSU financial status.

Conclusion and Court's Perspective

The court's analysis of the legal, factual, and policy issues involved.

- The court recognizes the complex interplay between statutory rules, administrative assurances, and financial constraints.
- The core legal question remains whether absorbed employees can claim pension revision under the 7th CPC.
- The court must balance legal principles, contractual promises, and fiscal responsibility.
- The final judgment will determine if the Tribunal's order directing pension revision will stand or be set aside based on the legal framework and evidence presented.
-

Dispute Over Pension Revision for Absorbed Employees

A legal debate centers on whether BSNL/MTNL absorbed employees are entitled to pension revision under the 7th CPC, based on Rule 37A and related government orders.

Application of 7th CPC Benefits to Respondents

The respondents argue they are entitled to 7th CPC benefits, including pension revision, due to extensions of gratuity and pension revision orders, and reliance on OM dated 12.05.2017.

- 7th CPC recommendations extended to respondents via OM dated 16.03.2017 and 21.03.2017.
- OM dated 12.05.2017 revised pension for pre-2016 pensioners, including respondents absorbed in PSUs.
- Respondents' pay is not revised; pay revision depends on PSU profitability and Rule 37A governs pension revision.
- High Court upheld applicability of OM 12.05.2017 to similarly placed absorbees; SLP filed was withdrawn.
-

Legal Arguments on Pay and Pension Revision

Petitioners contend pension cannot be revised under 7th CPC since respondents ceased to be government employees and are governed by PRC, not CPC.

- Pay revision depends on PSU profitability, not pension rules.
- PRC recommendations do not cover pension revision.
- Non-consideration of CAT decisions was argued but distinguished on facts; Kerala High Court upheld OM 12.05.2017.
- Respondents claim they were assured parity with central employees, supported by various OM and circulars.

- Respondents seek pension revision based on 7th CPC, citing Rule 37A and assurances at absorption.
-

Distinction Between CDA and IDA Pay Scales

The petitioners argue IDA pay scales are separate from CDA, and pension revision is not linked to pay scale changes.

- IDA scales are governed by PRC, not CPC; CDA scales are for central government employees.
- Absorbees fitted into IDA scale after 1989, with pay revision based on PRC recommendations.
- OM and absorption orders specify pension calculation based on last drawn IDA pay, not future CPC revisions.
- Circulars and OM clarify that pension formula applies at retirement, not for subsequent revisions.

•

Legal Framework and Rule 37A Interpretation

Rule 37A, inserted in 2000, creates a legal fiction that absorption equates to retirement from government service, with pension based on combined service.

- Absorbees cease to be government employees upon absorption; governed by PSU rules.
- Rule 37A (8) provides pension calculation based on the last pay in IDA scale, not future CPC revisions.
- Absorbees are entitled to pension as per the formula in force at retirement, not subsequent revisions.
- Judicial precedents emphasize that pay scales (CDA vs IDA) and recommendations are distinct; pension rights are linked to the rules at the time of retirement.
- Circulars and notes support that pension benefits are calculated based on IDA pay at retirement, not future CPC revisions.

•

Effect of Government Orders and Circulars

Various OM, notes, and circulars from 1989 to 2016 clarify absorption, pension calculation, and pay scales.

- OM dated 05.07.1989 offered options for pension retention; no promise of future pension revision.
- OM dated 25.09.2000 and Circular dated 09.11.2000 reaffirmed pension based on rules in force at retirement, with no guarantee of future revisions.
- OM dated 01.09.2008 and 2016 clarified pension revision applicability, emphasizing that CPC recommendations do not automatically extend to PSU employees.

- Absorbees' pension is calculated on IDA scale, with no obligation for future CPC-based revision.
- Circulars support that pension benefits are linked to the rules at the time of retirement, not subsequent CPC revisions.

•

Judicial Precedents on Pension and Pay Scales

Supreme Court and High Court decisions reinforce that pension rights depend on the rules at the time of retirement and that pay scales (CDA vs IDA) are distinct.

- Nakara case (1983) established pension as a property right, not a bounty.
- VSNL (2008) clarified IDA and CDA scales are separate; pension under IDA is not linked to CDA Dearness Relief.
- Court decisions emphasize that pay revisions by CPC do not automatically extend to PSU employees governed by PRC.
- Recommendations of Pay Commissions are expert advice; courts do not interfere unless arbitrariness is evident.
- Classification based on pay scale (CDA vs IDA) must have rational nexus; discrimination can be challenged under Article 14.

•

Conclusion on Pension Revision Entitlement

The court concludes that respondents' pension revision is limited to the formula in force at retirement, based on Rule 37A, and future CPC revisions do not automatically apply.

- Respondents are entitled to pension calculation based on IDA pay at the time of retirement.
- No guarantee or obligation exists for pension revision under 7th CPC or subsequent pay revisions.
- Benefits extended were only for pension calculation, not for future revision, aligning with statutory rules and judicial precedents.

•

Pension Revision for Absorbed Employees

The document discusses the legal and administrative framework regarding pension revision for government servants absorbed into PSUs like BSNL/MTNL, emphasizing the distinction between different categories of pensioners and the applicability of CPC and PRC recommendations. - Pension of government servants on permanent absorption in PSUs continues to be updated as per specific orders. - Cases where pensioners have drawn lump sum benefits equal to 100% of pension and restored one-third commuted pension are excluded. - Family pension, where applicable under CCS (Pension) Rules, will be updated accordingly. - The 6th CPC recommendations applied to all pre-01.01.2006 pensioners under CCS Rules, but a separate class was created for PSU absorbees with pro-rata pensioners. - Combined service pensioners, who draw pension based on service under

both government and PSU, are not covered under the specific orders for pro-rata pensioners. - The distinction between pro-rata and combined service pensioners is rational and does not violate Article 14. - OM dated 02.09.2008 aimed to implement 6th CPC recommendations for post-01.01.2006 pensioners, but did not explicitly cover PSU absorbees. - The OM of 01.09.2008 applies only to pro-rata pensioners; the later OM of 02.09.2008 does not extend benefits to combined service pensioners. - The 27.04.2009 clarification states that revised pension formulas under 6th CPC apply to absorbees governed by Rule 37A. - OMs related to 6th CPC (04.05.2009, 12.08.2009) extend pension calculation benefits but do not revise underlying pay scales. - The 7th CPC recommendations, implemented via OM dated 04.08.2016 and 12.05.2017, apply only to pro-rata pensioners drawing separate pension, not combined service pensioners. - The OM of 21.03.2017 extended death gratuity rates under 7th CPC but did not alter pension formulas for combined service pensioners. - The 2nd PRC and subsequent pay revision recommendations (3rd PRC) are applicable to CPSUs, but their implementation depends on PSU financial health. - RTI responses clarify that pension revision under CPC recommendations is linked to pay revision and applies only to pensioners drawing pension under CDA scale. - The Court concludes that Rule 37A provides a limited formula for pension calculation at retirement, not a right to future pension revision. - The distinction between IDA and CDA scales remains, and pension revision depends on pay revision, which has not been implemented post-2nd PRC. - The Court emphasizes the importance of expert recommendations and the non-interference in pay revision decisions, which are within executive domain. - The Court sets aside the Tribunal order, ruling that respondents are not entitled to pension revision under CPC recommendations, as they are combined service pensioners governed by IDA scale. - The legal framework and official communications affirm that pension revision is linked to pay revision, which has not been undertaken for these employees. - The Court underscores the statutory and administrative distinctions between Central Government employees and PSU absorbees, affirming that CPC recommendations do not automatically extend to the latter.

D.D. MISTRY
GS BDPA (INDIA)