

State Of Kerala,Represented By The ... vs [Bhaskaran . R.K,] *Died on 6 October, 2026

Author: [Anil K. Narendran](#)

Bench: [Anil K. Narendran](#)

CNR: KLHC010528592025

O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025

1

2026:KER:76132

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K. NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2026 / 14TH ASWINA, 1948

OP(KAT) NO. 274 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 16.12.2024 IN OA NO.1585 OF 2021

OF KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 4 IN O.A.:

1 STATE OF KERALA,
 REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
 HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT,
 GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
 KERALA, PIN – 695001

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL EDUCATION,

DIRECTORATE OF MEDICAL EDUCATION,
MEDICAL COLLEGE P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695011

- 3 THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL (A&E), KERALA,
OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001
- 4 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FINANCE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN – 695001

GP– SMT. ANN MARIA FRNACIS

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANTS 1 TO 4 IN O.A.:

- 1 [BHASKARAN. R.K.] DIED
S/O RAMAN, RETIRED NURSING ASSISTANT,
GOVERNMENT MEDICAL COLLEGE HOSPITAL,
KOTTAYAM, PIN-686008,

CNR: KLHC010528592025

O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025

2

2026:KER:76132

- 2 RESIDING AT THEKKEVILA VEEDU,
PERUMPUZHA P.O., KOLLAM, PIN – 691504
STATUS OF R1 IS SHOWN AS DIED IN THE CAUSE TITLE AS
PER ORDER DATED 06/01/2026 IN OP(KAT) 274/2025
YESODA.B.S,
W/O.SIVANANDAN, SHIBU MANDIRA, KIZHAVOOR,
MUKHATHA.P.O, KOLLAM, PIN – 691577
- 3 SINDHU.B.S,
D/O.R.K.BHASKARAN, GANGA BHAVAN, THEKKEVILA VEEDU,
PERUMPUZHA.P.O, KOLLAM, PIN – 691504
- 4 SANDYA.B.S,
W/O.MAHESH, SHIBU MANDIRA, KIZHAVOOR, MUKHATHALA.P.O,
KOLLAM., PIN – 691577

BY ADV SHRI.SHAMEENA SALAHUDHEEN, HCLSC PANEL ADVOCATE

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY
HEARD ON 23.07.2026, THE COURT ON 06.10.2026 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

CNR: KLHC010528592025

O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025

3

2026:KER:76132

JUDGMENT

Muralee Krishna S., J. "C.R."

Respondents 1 to 4 in O.A.No.1585 of 2021 on the file of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal, Thiruvananthapuram ('the Tribunal' for short), filed this original petition, invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India, challenging Ext.P8 order dated 16.12.2024 of the Tribunal in that original application.

2. The original application was originally filed by the now deceased applicant-1st respondent, who is the father of respondents 2 to 4. Going by the averments in the original application, the 1st respondent retired from service on 30.04.2007 while working as a Nursing Assistant in Government Medical College Hospital, Kottayam. But he applied for pensionary benefits only in the year 2017. Therefore, he was sanctioned pension with effect from 01.12.2017, as per Annexure A1 verification report dated 23.03.2018. He was not granted arrears of pension, stating the reason that Government sanction is required. The 1st respondent pleaded in the original application that he was suffering from various ailments including Cardiac problems. His wife died on 21.04.1990. In the year CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 4 2026:KER:76132 2016, he had undergone heart surgery in Sree Chithira Thirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology. Since he was bedridden on most of the days, he could not submit an application for pension in time. On the request of the 1st respondent, the 2nd petitioner, as per Annexure A2 letter dated 27.12.2019, requested the Government to sanction payment of arrears of pension to the 1st respondent from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017. It was stated in that letter that the arrears of pension will come to Rs.8,78,053/-. By way of abundant caution, the 1st respondent submitted Annexure A3 representation dated 07.01.2021 before the Government requesting to grant sanction to draw arrears of pension for the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017. Along with Annexure A3, the 1st respondent produced the registration card issued from the Sree Chithira Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology; treatment certificate dated 23.01.2017 issued from Sahachara Ayurveda Hospital and Rejuvenation Centre, Karunagappally; treatment certificate dated 08.08.2017 issued from Sree Chithira Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences Technology; and case summary and discharge record dated 21.12.2016 issued by the CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P. (KAT)No.274 of 2025 5 2026:KER:76132 Department of Cardio Vascular and Thoracic Surgery of Sree Chithira Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology.

2.1 Aggrieved by the delay in passing orders in Annexures A2 and A3 requests, the 1st respondent moved the Tribunal by filing O.A.No.205 of 2021. By Annexure A4 order dated 16.02.2021, the

Tribunal disposed of that original application, directing the Government to consider Annexure A3 representation, taking note of Annexure A2 request and pass orders within three months. Pursuant to Annexure A4, the 1st respondent was heard on 13.04.2021, and thereafter the Government issued Annexure A5 order dated 10.06.2021 rejecting the claim of the 1st respondent. In Annexure A5 order, it is stated that the 1st respondent failed to produce medical records to show that he was ill during the relevant period, though the 1st respondent had submitted Annexures A3(a) to A3(d) medical records, along with Annexure A3.

2.2 The 1st respondent further pleaded in the original application that a similarly situated person, namely, one Dr.Radhamani Amma, was granted arrears of pension by Annexure A6 order dated 22.08.2016 of the Government. It is CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 6 2026:KER:76132 the further case of the 1st respondent that no notice had been sent to him by the Head of the Office asking him to furnish the application for pension. A copy of Form 2 had not been sent to him by the Head of the Office where he was working at the time of retirement. Since the Head of the Office failed to discharge his duties, the delay in applying for pension cannot be attributed to the 1st respondent. With these pleadings, he filed O.A.No.1585 of 2021, invoking the provisions under [Section 19](#) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeking the following reliefs:

"i) Set aside Annexure A5.

ii) Declare that the applicant is entitled to get released arrears of pension for the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017.

iii) direct the respondents to grant sanction for disbursing arrears of pension to the applicant for the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017 and disburse the same within a time limit to be fixed by this Hon'ble Tribunal."

3. The 4th petitioner filed Ext.P2 reply statement dated 17.11.2021 in the original application, opposing the reliefs sought for. Paragraphs 4 to 12 of that reply statement read thus:

"4. Sri. Bhaskaran R.K, the Applicant, retired from service as Nursing Assistant, Government Medical College Hospital, Kottayam on 30.04.2007. He had submitted the application for pension only in the year 2017 and the CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P. (KAT)No.274 of 2025 7 2026:KER:76132 Accountant General authorised pension with effect from 01.12.2017. As Government sanction is necessary for releasing the arrears of pension from 01.05.2007 to 30.11.2017, Sri. Bhaskaran R.K. submitted his request for obtaining the sanction. The Applicant mentioned in his representation that the delay in submitting the application for pension occurred because he was seriously ill and submitted copies of some medical records. As the documents submitted was not sufficient to prove that he was under the treatment for the period from 2007-2016, his request for arrears of pension was rejected.

5. Later, the Applicant filed O.A.No.205 of 2021 before the Hon'ble Tribunal with a prayer to sanction arrears of pension from 01.05.2007 to 30.11.2017, wherein the first Respondent i.e., Secretary, Health & Family Welfare Department was directed to consider his representation dated 07.01.2021 and to pass appropriate orders within three months from the date of receipt of the order, after hearing the Applicant vide Annexure A4 Order dated 16.02.2021.

6. Accordingly, the Under Secretary, Health & Family Welfare Department heard the Applicant on 13.04.2021. As he had not produced any other additional documents at the

time of the hearing for substantiating the reason for non-submission of pension application in time, his request for arrears was rejected vide Annexure A5 G.O.(Rt) No.1231/2021/H&FWD dated 10.06.2021, in compliance of Annexure A4 Order dated 16.02.2021 in O.A.No.205 of 2021.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 8 2026:KER:76132

7. The Applicant mentioned in his representation that the delay in submitting the application for pension occurred because he was seriously ill and submitted copies of some medical records. On verification of the medical records, it is seen that he had produced a post dated Medical Certificate dated 23.01.2017 from Sahachara Ayurveda Hospital in which it is certified that he was suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis-and under treatment from 05.03.2007. All the other documents produced was regarding the treatment for cardiac problems from 07.12.2016 onwards. The documents submitted was not sufficient to prove that he was under treatment for the period 2007-2016.

8. As per Rule 110 of Part III KSRs, every Government employee should submit his formal application for pension at least one year in advance of the date of his anticipated retirement. As per Rule 120 of Part III KSRs, no Government sanction is necessary, if the pension is granted within three years from the date of retirement. If a pension is granted after three years from the date of retirement, retrospective effect should not be given to it without the special orders of the Government which granted it; in the absence of special orders, such a pension takes effect only from the date of sanction. As such special sanction for pension is given only for genuine reasons. Since he had not produced sufficient documents for substantiating the reason for non-submission of pension application in time, his request for arrears was rejected.

9. In the case of Dr. Radhamani Amma, cited by the CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P. (KAT)No.274 of 2025 9 2026:KER:76132 Applicant, she had been sanctioned pension arrears vide G.O. (Rt) No. 6931/2016/Fin dated 22.08.2016 on medical grounds, based on the Medical Certificate that she had produced, which was to pertaining to the non - submission period, substantiating her reason for non - submission of pension application.

10. In this case, one document submitted by the Applicant to show that he was ill during the relevant period, was one post dated Medical Certificate dated 23.01.2017 from Sahachara Ayurveda Hospital, in which it is certified that he was suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis and under treatment from 05.03.2007. All the other documents produced was regarding the treatment for cardiac problems from 08.09.2016 onwards only. Even though the Applicant retired from service on 30.04.2007, he had submitted the application for pension only in the year 2017 and the documents submitted was not sufficient to prove that he was under treatment for the period from 2007- 2016, disability herein from submitting the Applicants for pension during that period.

11. As per the provisions of Part III KSRs, pension should be sanctioned on a monthly basis. The pension is sanctioned on a monthly basis for meeting the day-to-day expenses of the Pensioner. There is no provision in the Rules for granting arrears of pension in case where the application for pension was not submitted in time and claiming the arrears years later. Further in the judgment dated 20.03.2006 in W.P.(C) No.7670 of 2006; [T.K Barathy Vs. the Principal Secretary to Government](#), the Hon'ble CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 10 2026:KER:76132 Court has observed

as follows: "It is true that pension. is not a bounty. from the State. The right to receive pension is statutorily recognised. But still a pensioner cannot have the luxury of choosing his/her own time to claim the arrears of pension.

12. As it was found that the Applicant has not produced sufficient documents for substantiating the reason for non- submission of pension application in time, his request for arrears was rejected as per the relevant Rules of Part III KSRs vide Annexure A5 G.O. (Rt) No.1231/2021/ H&FWD dated 10.06.2021."

4. Similarly, the 2nd petitioner filed Ext.P3 reply statement dated 22.02.2022 in a similar line as that of the reply statement of the 4th petitioner. Paragraphs 6 to 13 of that reply statement read thus:

"6. As per KSR, an employee should submit pension application to the Accountant General one year prior to his retirement. Pension will be submitted to the Accountant General within 3 years from the date of retirement. As per Rule 120 of Part III KSR, the pension will be given with retrospective effect only if there is special Government approval in the pension applications submitted after 3 years after the date of retirement. Special permission can be given to grant pension from the date of retirement, only if there is a valid reason. In cases where there is no special Government sanction, the pension is eligible only from the date of the order granting the pension.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 11 2026:KER:76132

7. The Applicant has submitted the pension application only after 10 years of his retirement from the service. Even though the Principal, Government Medical College, Kottayam has pointed out that the pension application was not submitted in time due to ill health of the Applicant, no medical records have been submitted to prove that the Applicant was ill. During that period. Therefore, arrears of pension from 01.05.2007 to 30.11.2017 cannot be granted as claimed by the Applicant in this OA.

8. The delay occurred in authorising the Applicant's pension is not because of any lapses from the part of the Respondents. The Applicant did not submit his application for pension and other requisites documents in time. The delay of 10 years occurred in the said matter solely due to the negligence on the part of Applicant above.

9. The contention of the Applicant is that he has undergone serious ailments and various medical treatments in many hospitals. However, he did not intimate the fact to the pension sanctioning authority and submit requisite papers for sanctioning his pension. As per KSR, an employee should submit his pension application one year prior to his retirement. Pension will be sanctioned for the date of retirement only if the pensioner submits his application within three years of retirement.

10. In compliance of the Annexure A4 order of Hon'ble Tribunal dated 16.02.2021 in OA.No.205/2021 filed by the Applicant, the Applicant was heard by the Government and the contentions of the Applicant were examined in detail and the claims of the Applicant for arrears of pension for CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 12 2026:KER:76132 the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017 was finally rejected since it lacked merit. The Annexure A5 Order issued by the 1st respondent is after considering all the aspects of the case and hence it is sustainable by law.

11. The Applicant produced certificates of his medical treatments to the Pension Sanctioning Authority only on 01.12.2017, that too, after 10 years of his retirement.

12. The Applicant must have furnished his applications for pension along with required documents one month before his retirement. However, he did not respond for a long period of 01.12.2017. The case of Smt. Radhamani Amma covered by Annexure A6 Order cannot be considered exactly similar as that of the Applicant's.

13. The pension in respect of the Applicant was delayed only because of the negligence of the Applicant himself and there was no discriminatory attitude of the Pension Sanctioning Authority leading these situations."

5. Meanwhile, respondents 2 to 4 were impleaded in the original application due to the death of the 1st respondent. Respondents 2 to 4 filed Ext.P4 rejoinder dated 10.08.2022 producing therewith Annexures A7 and A7(a) documents. They have subsequently filed Ext.P5 miscellaneous application to amend the original application by incorporating additional pleadings therein. To the amended original application, the 4th petitioner filed Ext.P6 additional reply statement dated 10.11.2023. On behalf of the 1st petitioner, Ext.P7 reply CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 13 2026:KER:76132 statement dated 06.03.2024 is filed in the original application. Paragraphs 5 to 17 of that reply statement read thus:

"5. The applicant, though retired from service on superannuation on 30.04.2007, did not submit any request for sanctioning his terminal benefits, including pension, for a period extending up to 01.12.2017. Hence, the proposal for sanctioning his pension and other terminal benefits could not be processed and forwarded to the third respondent for authorizing the same. The applicant did not even intimate his inability to submit papers for his pension during this period. As per KSR, an employee should submit a pension application to the Accountant General one year prior to his retirement and within 3 years from the date of retirement. As per Rule 120 part III KSR, pension will be given with retrospective effect only if there is special Government approval in the pension applications submitted 3 years after the date of retirement. Special permission can be given to grant a pension from the date of retirement only if there is a valid reason. In cases where there is no special Government sanction, the pension is eligible from the date of the order granting the pension. The applicant submitted the pension application 10 years after he had retired from the service. The Principal, Government Medical College, Kottayam, has pointed out that the pension application was not submitted in time due to ill health. However no medical records have been submitted to prove that the applicant was ill during that period. Therefore, pension arrears can not be granted from CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 14 2026:KER:76132 01.05.2007 to 30.11.2017.

6. The delay in authorizing the applicant's pension is not because of any lapses on the part of the respondents. The applicant did not submit his application for pension and other requisites documents in time. A delay of 10 years occurred in the matter due to negligence on the part of the applicant

7. The contention of the applicant is that he was suffering from various ailments and various medical treatments in many hospitals. However, he did not intimate the fact to the pension sanctioning authority or submit the requisite papers for sanctioning his pension. As per KSR, all employees should submit his pension application one year prior to his

retirement. Pension will be sanctioned from the date of retirement only if the pensioner submits his application within three years of retirement. As per Rule 120 of Part III K.S.Rs, if the pension is granted after 3 years from the date of retirement, retrospective effect shall not be given without special orders of the Government. Government sanction is required when a pension is granted after 3 years from the date of retirement, and retrospective effect shall not be given to it without special orders of the Government and that pension would take effect only from the date of sanction. As per Rule 135, if a pension remains undrawn for more than 3 years, the pension ceases to be payable. As per Circular No.3/2000/Fin dated 17.01.2000, such arrears of pension can be granted only in deserving cases. As per Rule 110 of Part III K.S.R., every Government employee shall submit CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 15 2026:KER:76132 his formal application for pension at least one year in advance of the date of retirement. The applicant submitted the same only in 2017. As no administrative delay occurred in sanctioning the pension and the delay happened only due to the fault of the applicant, the applicant's claim for pension with retrospective effect cannot be granted and he is not eligible for arrears.

8. In deference to the order of the Hon'ble Kerala Administrative Tribunal dated 16.02.2021 in O.A. No.205 of 2021 filed by the applicant, he was heard by the Government. The Government examined all the contentions of the applicant in detail and finally rejected the claims of the applicant for arrears of pension for the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017 since it lacked merit.

9. The applicant produced certificates of his medical treatments to the pension sanctioning authority only on 01.12.2017, that is after 10 years of his retirement.

10. Being a Government servant, he cannot be ignorant of his date of retirement. As per KSR Part III Rule 110, every Government employee shall submit a formal application for pension in form II to the Head Office at least one year in advance of the date of anticipated retirement. Hence, it was his responsibility to submit the application in due time. However, the applicant submitted his pension application after 10 years stating that he had been suffering from various ailments and health problems, without producing any valid medical documents to prove his unhealthy conditions.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 16 2026:KER:76132

11. The Order issued by the 1st respondent is after considering all the aspects of the case, and hence, it is sustainable by law.

12. The Order issued by the 1st respondent was after considering all the aspects of the case and hence it is sustainable by law. As per Rule 120 of Part III KSRs, if the pension is granted after 3 years from the date of retirement, retrospective effect shall not be given without special orders of the Government. Government sanction is required when a pension is granted after 3 years from the date of retirement and retrospective effect shall not be given to it without special orders of the Government and that pension would take effect only from the date of sanction. As per Rule 135, if a pension remains undrawn for more than 3 years, the pension ceases to be payable. As per Circular No.3/2000/Fin dated 17.01.2000, such arrears of pension can be granted only in deserving cases. As per Rule 110 of Part III K.S.R., every Government employee shall submit his formal application for pension at least one year in advance of the date of retirement. The applicant submitted the

same only in 2017. As no administrative delay occurred in sanctioning the pension and the delay happened only due to the fault of the applicant, the applicant's claim for pension with retrospective effect cannot be granted and he is not eligible for arrears.

13. The applicant must have furnished his application for pension along with the required documents one month before his retirement. However, he did not respond for a CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 17 2026:KER:76132 long period of 10 years.

14. The pension in respect of the applicant was delayed only because of the negligence of the applicant himself, and there was no discriminatory attitude of the pension sanctioning authority leading these situations.

15. Annexure A5 order issued by the 1st respondent was after a detailed examination of the case and hence is sustainable. Smt. Radhamani Amma's case cannot be compared to that of the applicant. The pension due to the applicant was delayed due to extreme negligence on the part of the applicant himself.

16. There is no violation of any rule or constitutional rights in considering and taking a decision on the claims of the petitioner. The respondent acted with extreme care and diligence in examining the case of the applicant and taking the final decision in the matter pursuing all the relevant rules and ensuring all the legitimate rights of the applicant.

17. As per the Rules, an employee should submit his pension application one year prior to his retirement. Pension will be sanctioned from the date of retirement only if the pension application is submitted within 3 years from the date of retirement. Being a Government servant, he must be aware of his date of retirement and as per KSR Part II Rule 110, every Government employee shall submit a formal application for pension in form II to the Head Office at least one year in advance of the date of anticipated retirement. Hence, it was his responsibility to submit the application in due time. Therefore, the claim of the applicant cannot be conceded."

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 18 2026:KER:76132

6. By Ext.P8 impugned order dated 16.12.2024, the Tribunal disposed of the original application by setting aside Annexure A5 order dated 10.06.2021 of the Government and declared that the 1st respondent was entitled to get the arrears of pension for the period from 01.05.2007 to 01.12.2017. The petitioners were directed to disburse that amount to respondents 2 to 4 within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of that order. After referring to Rules 110 and 115 of Part III of the Kerala Service Rules ('KSR' for short), the Tribunal in the impugned order held thus:

"The respondents do not have any answer to the contention of the applicant with respect to the duty to be performed by the Head of Office. The duty to be performed under Rule 110 comes only after the Head of Office informs him about it, as required in Rule 115(a). Therefore, though there was a delay of 10 years in submitting the application, the contention of the respondents that it was the responsibility of the applicant to submit the application within one year before his retirement as provided under Rule 110 cannot be accepted.

10. The respondents do not have a case that the late Bhaskaran did not submit the application for pension, even after he was required to submit the same. When the statutory duty on the part of the Head of the Office is not CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.

(KAT)No.274 of 2025 19 2026:KER:76132 performed, the deceased 1st applicant, who was only a Nursing Assistant, cannot be denied the pensionary benefits, which he had earned on account of the service rendered by him. It is also seen that the he had produced the certificates from the Ayurveda Hospital to the effect that he was suffering from Arthritis and undergoing treatment from 2007 onwards. The respondents cannot adopt different yardsticks on acceptance of medical certificates for the purpose of according sanction for arrears of pension, as evident from the file notes leading to Annexure A6.

11. In the circumstances, the order Annexure A5 is set aside. It is declared that the 1st applicant was entitled to get the arrears of pension for the period from 1.5.2007 to 1.12.2017. There shall be a direction to the respondents to see that the same is disbursed to applicants 2 to 4 within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Original Application is accordingly disposed of."

7. Being aggrieved, the State and its Officials are now before this Court with this original petition.

8. Heard the learned Government Pleader and the learned Counsel for the respondents.

9. The learned Government Pleader vehemently argued that as per Rule 110 of Part III KSR, there is a duty on the Government employee to submit a formal application for pension CNR:

KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 20 2026:KER:76132 at least one year in advance of the date of anticipated retirement. The 1st respondent did not submit any application for pension for nearly ten years. By pointing out Rule 120 of Part III KSR, the learned Government Pleader submitted that in the absence of special orders of the Government, the pension takes effect only from the date of sanction. In the instant case, the pension was granted to the 1st respondent from the date of his application, since there was no special order by the Government. When the application was forwarded to the Government for special order, noting that the medical certificates produced by the 1st respondent are insufficient to support his claim for not submitting any application for pension for about ten years, it was not allowed by the Government. By pointing out Rule 135 of Part III KSR, [Article 294](#) of the Kerala Treasury Code and Rule 294 under Chapter VII of the Kerala Treasury Rules, the learned Government Pleader argued that if a pension remains undrawn for more than three years, the pension ceases to be payable. The learned Government Pleader further submitted that by the Government Circular dated 17.01.2000, relying on Rule 136 of Part III KSR and [Article 294](#) of the Kerala Treasury Code, it was CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P. (KAT)No.274 of 2025 21 2026:KER:76132 brought to the notice of the pensioners that if they are unable to appear before the pension disbursing agencies, they can engage agents to receive their pension. Therefore, according to the learned Government Pleader, there is no illegality in the dismissal of the application submitted by the 1st respondent for pension arrears by the Government. The learned Government Pleader relied on the judgment of the Apex Court in [Union of India v. Tarsem Singh](#) [(2008) 8 SCC 648], and that of a Division Bench of this Court in [State of Kerala v. Jaseentha M. O.](#) [2017 (2) KLT SN 82] in support of her arguments.

10. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the 1st respondent submitted that there is no absolute bar in granting arrears of pension to an employee who omitted to file an application for pension for more than three years. The only rider in the Rules is that it should be granted only with the sanction of the Government. From Annexure A3 series documents produced along with his application for pension submitted to the Government, it can be seen that the 1st respondent was laid up due to illness and hence the claiming of pension was delayed. In a similar case as that of the

1st respondent, the Government CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 22 2026:KER:76132 sanctioned pension to one Dr. Radhamani Amma and the non- granting of pension to the 1st respondent is a discrimination against him.

11. [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India deals with the power of superintendence over all courts by the High Court. Under clause (1) of [Article 227](#) of the Constitution, every High Court shall have superintendence over all courts and tribunals throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction.

12. In [Shalini Shyam Shetty v. Rajendra Shankar Patil](#) [(2010) 8 SCC 329] the Apex Court, while analysing the scope and ambit of the power of superintendence under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution, held that the object of superintendence, both administrative and judicial, is to maintain efficiency, smooth and orderly functioning of the entire machinery of justice in such a way as it does not bring it into any disrepute. The power of interference under [Article 227](#) is to be kept to the minimum to ensure that the wheel of justice does not come to a halt and the fountain of justice remains pure and unpolluted in order to CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 23 2026:KER:76132 maintain public confidence in the functioning of the tribunals and courts subordinate to the High Court.

13. In [Jai Singh v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi](#) [(2010) 9 SCC 385], while considering the nature and scope of the powers under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India, the Apex Court held that, undoubtedly the High Court, under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution, has the jurisdiction to ensure that all subordinate courts, as well as statutory or quasi-judicial tribunals exercise the powers vested in them, within the bounds of their authority. The High Court has the power and the jurisdiction to ensure that they act in accordance with the well established principles of law. The exercise of jurisdiction must be within the well recognised constraints. It cannot be exercised like a 'bull in a china shop', to correct all errors of the judgment of a court or tribunal, acting within the limits of its jurisdiction. This correctional jurisdiction can be exercised in cases where orders have been passed in grave dereliction of duty or in flagrant abuse of fundamental principles of law or justice.

14. In [K.V.S. Ram v. Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation](#) [(2015) 12 SCC 39] the Apex Court CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 24 2026:KER:76132 held that, in exercise of the power of superintendence under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India, the High Court can interfere with the order of the court or tribunal only when there has been a patent perversity in the orders of the tribunal and courts subordinate to it or where there has been gross and manifest failure of justice or the basic principles of natural justice have been flouted.

15. In [Sobhana Nair K.N. v. Shaji S.G. Nair](#) [2016 (1) KHC 1] a Division Bench of this Court held that, the law is well settled by a catena of decisions of the Apex Court that in proceedings under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot sit in appeal over the findings recorded by the lower court or tribunal and the jurisdiction of this Court is only supervisory in nature and not that of an appellate court. Therefore, no interference under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution is called for, unless this Court finds that the lower court or tribunal has committed manifest error, or the reasoning is palpably perverse or patently unreasonable, or the decision of the lower court or tribunal is in direct conflict with settled principles of law.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 25 2026:KER:76132

16. In view of the law [laid down in](#) the decisions referred to supra, the High Court in exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India cannot sit in appeal over the

findings recorded by a lower court or tribunal. The supervisory jurisdiction cannot be exercised to correct all errors of the order or judgment of a lower court or tribunal, acting within the limits of its jurisdiction. The correctional jurisdiction under [Article 227](#) can be exercised only in a case where the order or judgment of a lower court or tribunal has been passed in grave dereliction of duty or in flagrant abuse of fundamental principles of law or justice. Therefore, no interference under [Article 227](#) is called for, unless the High Court finds that the lower court or tribunal has committed manifest error, or the reasoning is palpably perverse or patently unreasonable, or the decision of the lower court or tribunal is in direct conflict with settled principles of law or where there has been gross and manifest failure of justice or the basic principles of natural justice have been flouted.

17. We have carefully gone through the pleadings and materials on record and appreciated rival submissions made at CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 26 2026:KER:76132 the Bar. Admittedly, the 1st respondent retired from service on 30.04.2007. He submitted an application for pension only in the year 2017, which was granted with effect from 01.12.2017 by Annexure A1 order dated 23.03.2018. As per Annexure A2 request made by the 2nd petitioner, the pension arrears due to the 1st respondent will come to Rs.8,78,053/-. The 1st respondent had then submitted Annexure A3 representation dated 07.01.2021 annexed with Annexures A3(a) to A3(d) medical records to show that he was suffering from illness and hence the delay happened in filing the application for pension. However, by Annexure A5 order dated 10.06.2021, the Government rejected the claim of the 1st respondent for arrears of pension. In this regard, it is relevant to note the provisions under Part III of KSR which govern the field. Rules 110, 115, 119, 120 and 135 of Part III KSR as it stood on the relevant period, read thus:

"Rule 110. Every Government employee shall submit a formal application for pension in Form II, Gazetted Government Employees shall send their applications direct to the Audit Officer and non-gazetted employees to the head of office. Every Government employee should submit his formal application for pension at least one year in CNR:

KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 27 2026:KER:76132 advance of the date of his anticipated retirement:

Provided that,

- (i) In cases in which the date of retirement cannot be foreseen one year in advance, the application shall be submitted immediately after the date of retirement is settled; and
- (ii) A Government employee proceeding on leave preparatory to retirement in excess of one year, shall submit the application at the time of proceeding on such leave; and
- (iii) When a Government employee dies without making a formal application before his retirement, the authority competent to sanction pension may relax the provision of this rule and sanction pension or gratuity due to the Government employee from the date of retirement up to and inclusive of the date of his death as if he had made a formal application for the same before retirement.

The pension or gratuity sanctioned in accordance with this proviso may be paid to the heirs of the deceased in accordance with the normal provisions of the Rules. Note:- The authority competent to make appointment to the post vacated by the retiring Government Servant shall be competent to sanction the pension of that retiring Government Servant. However, Government shall have also power to sanction the pension of any retiring Government Servant.

xxxx xxxx xxxx Rule 115. (a) As a first step the Head of Office shall send to every Non-Gazetted Government employee a notice CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 28 2026:KER:76132 requiring him to furnish the formal application one year in advance with relevant documents. The Head of Office shall also draw attention of the retiring Government employee to the provisions of Rule 119.

(b) Thereafter, the Head of office shall fill in, in accordance with the instructions in Form 3 the first two pages of Form 2 irrespective of the fact whether a formal application for pension is received from the Government employee or not, and proceed as follows:--

(i) He should see that the annual certificates of verification for the entire service are recorded in the Service Book or Service Roll, as the case may be. The omissions, if any, shall be supplied by him with reference to the pay bills, acquittance rolls and other relevant records.

(ii) The unverified portion of service rendered by the Government employee in another office or department, if any, shall be got verified and the certificate of verification recorded by the concerned head of Office/Department.

(iii) If any portion of service rendered by a Government employee is not capable of being verified in the manner specified in sub-clauses (i) and (ii), the Government employee shall be required to file a written statement on plain paper in the following form:--

xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx He shall also be asked to produce all documentary evidence in support of the written statement and furnish any further information available with him.

(c)(i) The Head of Office shall complete the entries in Form 2 in all respects as soon as the formal application is CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 29 2026:KER:76132 received from the Government employee.

(ii) As the receiving authority, the head of office shall, on page 3 of Form 2, certify as to whether the character, conduct and past service of the Government employee are such as to entitle him to pension. He shall also record therein his opinion as to whether the service (including the unverified portion of service if any, for which written statement has been obtained from the Government employee himself) claimed has been established and should be admitted or not.

(iii) He shall then send the pension application in duplicate, along with the documents referred to in Form 3 to the pension sanctioning authority for sanction.

(iv) The pension sanctioning authority shall on receipt, record in both the application his orders for the grant of pension, death-cum-retirement gratuity and family pension and forward one copy with the documents to the Audit Officer, and the other copy to the head of the office for record in his office.

(v) If any event afterwards occurs which has bearing on the amount of pension admissible, the fact shall be promptly reported to the Audit Officer by the authority sanctioning the pension.

(vi) A certificate as to the satisfactory nature of service rendered by the Government employee for the period from the date of admitting service by the pension sanctioning authority to the date of actual retirement shall also be forwarded to the Audit Officers within a week from the date on which he retires. Details of any Government dues CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 30 2026:KER:76132 outstanding against the Government employee and the steps taken to

safeguard the interests of Government in this behalf shall be intimated to the Audit Officer simultaneously.

xxxx xxxx xxxx Rule 119. Apart from special orders, an ordinary pension is payable from the date on which the pensioner ceased to be borne on the establishment.

Note:-- The pension of an employee, who, under rule 40, has received a gratuity in lieu of notice of discharge is not payable for the period in respect of which the gratuity is paid.

Rule 120. The preceding Rule applies to ordinary, not to special cases. If, under special circumstances a pension is granted after three years an employee has retired, retrospective effect should not be given to it without the special orders of the Government which granted it; in the absence of special orders, such a pension takes effect only from the date of sanction. No Government sanction is necessary, if the pension is granted within three years from the date of retirement.

	xxxx		xxxx		xxxx
Rule 135.	Lapses and forfeiture.--				
If a	Pension/Family		Pension/Compassionate		Allowance
remains	undrawn	for	more than three	years,	the

Pension/Family Pension/Compassionate Allowance ceases to be payable." (Underline supplied)

18. A reading of the aforesaid provisions would make it clear that Rule 120 of Part III KSR does not bar granting of CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 31 2026:KER:76132 pension after three years, but the only rider is that sanction by the Government is necessary for the same. The reason for the incorporation of the aforesaid provision in the KSR is to avoid unreasonable claims after a long lapse of time without showing sufficient cause. Similarly, Rule 135 applies to the case of non- drawing of sanctioned pension for three years and not a situation which is contemplated in Rule 120

19. During the course of arguments, the learned Government Pleader relied on the circular dated 17.01.2000 issued by the Finance (Pension-C) Department; which reads thus:

"It has come to the notice of the Government that the requests for revalidation of PPOs. invoking [Article 294](#) of K. T.C. Vol. I and Rule 136 Part III KSRs. from pensioners and family pensioners for the reason of non-drawal of pension in time or for various other reasons, are on increase. Being away from the State is the usually furnished reason for non-drawal of pension. Government have recently enhanced the period of validity of the pension when not drawn, from 1 year to 3 years. The provisions under Rule 136 Part III KSRs. is intended to be used sparingly and in exceptional cases only. Accordingly Government hereby issue following general instructions regarding the application of this provision.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 32 2026:KER:76132

2. As per Rule 126, Part III KSRs a pensioner specially exempted from personal appearance, or suffering from bodily illness, can draw the pension through production of Life Certificate. As per Rule 129 (a) Part III KSRs. a pensioner who resides in the State may draw his pension through a duly authorised agent possessing a legally valid Power of Attorney who must produce a Life Certificate as provided in Rule 126 *ibid.* on each occasion unless the duly authorised agent has executed an Indemnity Bond to refund the

over payments in which case he has to produce the Life Certificate once in a year. As per Note thereunder this procedure is also applicable to all pensioners who reside outside the State, provided they obtain permission of Reserve Bank of India for such drawal of the pension. Such Agents who had executed the Indemnity Bond have to produce Annual Life Certificate.

3. The rules provide monthly payment of Pension and Family Pension. Non drawal for a long period is not envisaged. That is why it is provided in Rule 133 Part III KSRs. that pension will lapse and forfeit if not drawn for one year now extended to 3 years.

4. Government intend to bring to the notice of all pensioners and Pension Disbursing Officers that in cases where the pensioners are unable to appear before the Pension Disbursing agencies, they can engage agents to receive their pension as provided in the rules mentioned above. Pensioners and Family Pensioners who could not draw pension when they were out of station to join their children elsewhere or for other valid reasons should utilise CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 33 2026:KER:76132 the facility provided in the rules itself.

5. Government also make it clear that the provisions of revalidation of PPOs. and drawal of arrears for such non- drawal periods in terms of Rule 136 Part III, KSRs. read with [Article 294](#) KTC Vol. I will be invoked in future very sparingly and only in deserving circumstances and not on vague reasons like out of station etc. It will be resorted only after the avenues offered by the Rule 129 Part III, KSRs, are exhausted or could not be availed for valid reasons." (Underline supplied)

20. The reading of the above circular also makes it clear that it is applicable only in the case of drawing of already sanctioned pension, and not to the cases like that of the 1 st respondent.

21. In Tarsem Singh [(2008) 8 SCC 648], in the case of arrears of disability pension payable to a pensioner from the Indian Army, the Apex Court held thus:

"5. To summarise, normally, a belated service related claim will be rejected on the ground of delay and laches (where remedy is sought by filing a writ petition) or limitation (where remedy is sought by an application to the Administrative Tribunal). One of the exceptions to the said rule is cases relating to a continuing wrong. Where a service related claim is based on a continuing wrong, relief can be granted even if there is a long delay in seeking remedy, with reference to the date on which the continuing CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 34 2026:KER:76132 wrong commenced, if such continuing wrong creates a continuing source of injury. But there is an exception to the exception. If the grievance is in respect of any order or administrative decision which related to or affected several others also, and if the reopening of the issue would affect the settled rights of third parties, then the claim will not be entertained. For example, if the issue relates to payment or refixation of pay or pension, relief may be granted in spite of delay as it does not affect the rights of third parties. But if the claim involved issues relating to seniority or promotion etc., affecting others, delay would render the claim stale and doctrine of laches/limitation will be applied. In so far as the consequential relief of recovery of arrears for a past period, the principles relating to recurring/successive wrongs will apply. As a consequence, High Courts will restrict the consequential relief relating to arrears normally to a period of three years prior to the date of filing of the writ petition." (Underline supplied)

22. In Jaseentha M.O. [2017 (2) KLT SN 82], in the case of claim for arrears of salary of the respondent therein, who was working as junior lecturer, the Division Bench of this Court held thus:

"16. Here, it is significant to note that no one is affected by paying the eligible salary to the petitioner. No hardship or injustice is caused to third parties by disbursing the amount actually due to her. Relying on the principles [laid down in](#) the decisions (supra) we are also not prepared to CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 35 2026:KER:76132 make an observation to deprive a relief which she is legally entitled. But the fact that similar relief was granted by this Court in a similar case cannot be a proper explanation for the delay or laches. Therefore, the claim for salary of the petitioner is restricted for a period of three years, back to 2008 and it is not granted for the entire period from 2001 to 2008 as claimed, applying the doctrine of limitation based on public policy". (Underline supplied)

23. Rule 294 under Chapter VII of Kerala Treasury Rules relied by the learned Government pleader which deals with lapse of pension reads thus:

"(a) If a pension payable in India remains undrawn for more than one year, the pension shall cease to be payable (Rule 135, Part III of the Kerala Service Rules, V Edition). [The period is now amended as three years in Rule 135]

(b) If the pensioner afterwards appears, the disbursing officer may renew his payments. He shall not, however, pay the arrears without the orders of the Accountant General and, if the pension in arrears is to be paid or the first time or if the amount of the arrears exceeds Rs.

5,000, without obtaining through the Accountant General the previous sanction of the Government (Rule 136, Part III of the Kerala Service Rules, V Edition). If, however the Accountant General considers that the suspension of payment was due to error or neglect on the part of any public officer, he may direct that the arrears be paid without the orders of the Government. (Rule 137, Part III of the Kerala Service Rules, V Edition)."

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 36 2026:KER:76132 (Underline supplied)

24. In [State of Kerala v. Pappan](#) [2021 (2) KLT 774], a Division Bench of this Court while considering the original petition filed under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India against the order of the Tribunal directing the Government to reconsider the matter and issue appropriate orders under Rule 120 of Part III KSR and sanction pensionary benefits to the original applicant therein from the date of his retirement, held thus:

"9. There cannot be any quarrel in the stipulation in Rule 119 of Part III KSR that an ordinary pension is taken from the date on which the pensioner ceased to be borne on the establishment. However, it is qualified with the condition that apart from special orders an ordinary pension is payable from the date on which the pensioner ceased to be borne on the establishment. Therefore a combined reading of Rule 119 and Rule 120 of Part III KSR would indicate that according to understanding of the rule making authority Rule 119 applies to ordinary cases. Under special cases and if under special circumstances a pension is granted long after the employee has retired, retrospective effect should not be given to him without special order of the Government which granted it and in the absence of special order the said pension takes effect only from the date of sanction as per R.120. Strictly speaking, the adverse scenario envisaged in the second limb of R.120 of CNR:

KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 37 2026:KER:76132 the Part II KSR would come into play only if the reasons for the delay in submitting the pension papers is solely on account of the fault of the pensioner concerned and that if he had submitted the pension papers immediately after his retirement, there was no legal impediment whatsoever for the authorities concerned to consider and pass orders on the sanction of pension, etc. In the instant case, since even the regularisation of the suspension period has been rendered long after the judgment of acquittal and even the formal orders regarding determination of last pay and pay fixation has been done only as late as on 30.12.2013 as per Annexure A2 and on 13.08.2014 as per Annexure A3 order. The Tribunal has rightly held that nothing would have materialised, even if the applicant had submitted the pension immediately thereafter." (Underline supplied)

25. In Pappan [2021 (2) KLT 774], on the arguments raised based on Rule 135 of Part III KSR, the Division [Bench further held](#) thus:

"13. It is pointed out that Rule 135 Part III KSR deals with lapses and forfeiture and it stipulates that if a pension remains undrawn for more than three years, the pension cease to be payable. We have already dealt with in detail the state of affairs in a fluid state whereby even the departmental authorities would not have been unaware about the exact and precise last pay of the applicant without regularisation of the suspension period and the issuance of the Government orders for the last pay and sanction of pay fixation, etc. for the purpose of the grant CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 38 2026:KER:76132 of pensionary benefits, after the termination of the criminal proceedings as understood in Rule 3 Part III KSR. The jurisdictional facts required for the invocation of Rule 135 of Part III KSR would arise only in a case where the pension has been duly sanctioned and for no justifiable reasons the incumbent is not actually drawing the benefits of the said sanctioned pensionary benefits and if that scenario occurs or the pension remained undrawn for more than three years, then only the resultant situation of cessation of the pension will come into play. The said Rule 135 of Part III KSR can have no application even in the remotest manner in the facts and circumstances of this case and hence we repel the said contention raised by the petitioners based on Rule 135 of Part III KSR.

14. Moreover, to a specific query raised by us, both the learned Senior Government Pleader and Sri K.S.Madhusoodanan, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that now the entire disbursal of pensionary benefits are done electronically by remitting the amounts concerned directly to the account of the pensioner / beneficiary concerned as in the case of salaries of Government employees. If that be so, prima facie, the factual scenario of the pensioner not actually drawing the pension amounts after its sanction, may not arise at all after the dramatic change of the very methodology of disbursal and release of pensionary amounts due to the pensioners concerned. At any rate, the above said Rule 135 of Part III KSR has no application to the facts and circumstances of this case.

CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 39 2026:KER:76132

15. Further, there is a cardinal aspect of the matter, which is that it is well established that pension is a property of the pensioner and the right to property guaranteed in [Art.300A](#) of the Constitution of India, can be deprived only in accordance with a procedure established by law, which is just, fair and reasonable. We do not have the slightest doubt that in the instance, the deprivation of the property right of the applicant on the basis of the above

said aspects, cannot be said to be on the basis of a procedure, that is just, fair and reasonable. Hence the impugned action is illegal and is also ultra vires the provisions in [Art.300A](#) of the Constitution of India".

(Underline supplied)

26. In Tarsem Singh [(2008) 8 SCC 648] and Jaseentha M.O. [2017 (2) KLT SN 82], the issue was the claim for arrears of salary. The provisions relied are also different. Therefore, the dictum in those judgments cannot be applied to the present case which is based on different sets of rules. In Pappan [2021 (2) KLT 774] also, the facts are entirely different. In that case, delay in submitting the pension papers happened due to the pendency of a vigilance case against the pensioner therein. But even then this Court held it as a sufficient reason for delay in submitting the pension papers. After noting the principles stated in Pappan [2021 (2) KLT CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 40 2026:KER:76132 774], as extracted above, it is not necessary to state it again that Rule 135 of Part III KSR and Rule 294 under Chapter VII of Kerala Treasury Rules are applicable to the case of non claiming of sanctioned pension for more than 3 years without sufficient reason and therefore those provisions are not applicable to the present case.

27. In the instant case, admittedly, the Head of the Office did not issue any notice to the 1st respondent requiring him to furnish the formal application one year in advance with relevant documents. Of course, it is true that there is a duty upon the 1st respondent to submit the application for pension, even if no notice was received from the Head of the Office, as he will be aware of the fact that he will be retiring in a short while. But, the fact remains that the Head of the Office also did not perform his duty in the case of the 1st respondent as provided under Rule 115 of Part III KSR.

28. It is also relevant to note in this particular case that in Annexure A5 order, there was no detailed consideration of the medical records submitted by the 1st respondent as Annexure A3(a) series along with his application for arrears of pension CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 41 2026:KER:76132 submitted to the Government. As rightly found by the Tribunal, there is no explanation from the part of the Government as far as Annexure A6 order pertaining to another similarly situated employee, except stating that the said employee had submitted medical records to show the delay in applying for pension. From the reading of Rule 120 of Part III KSR and Annexure A6 order, it can only be said that the bar under Rule 120 is not an absolute bar against granting arrears of pension even for a period of more than three years.

29. Having considered the pleadings and materials on record in the light of the judgments referred to supra, we find no illegality or impropriety in the impugned order of the Tribunal which warrants interference by exercising supervisory jurisdiction under [Article 227](#) of the Constitution of India.

In the result, the original petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-

ANIL K. NARENDRAN, JUDGE Sd/-

MURALEE KRISHNA S., JUDGE nak CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 42 2026:KER:76132 APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 274 OF 2025 PETITIONER ANNEXURES
Annexure A1 TRUE COPY OF THE VERIFICATION REPORT NO.P.R.2101897092/P-
12/3/1018380134 DATED 23.03.2018 Annexure A2 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER
NO.J4/3368/2019/MED DATED 27.12.2019 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT, WITHOUT ITS
ENCLOSURE.

Annexure A3 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 07.01.2021 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT Annexure A3(a) TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CARD ISSUED FROM SREE CHITHIRA TIRUNAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM Annexure A3(b) TRUE COPY OF THE TREATMENT CERTIFICATE DATED 23.01.2017 ISSUED FROM SAHACHARA AYURVEDA HOSPITAL AND REJUVANATION CENTRE, KARUNAGAPPALLY Annexure A3(d) TRUE COPY OF THE CASE SUMMARY AND DISCHARGE RECORD ISSUED ON 21.12.2016 BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CARDIO VASCULAR AND THORASIC SURGERY, SREE CHITHIRA TIRUNAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

Annexure A3(c) TRUE COPY OF THE TREATMENT CERTIFICATE DATED 08.08.2017 ISSUED FROM SREE CHITHIRA TIRUNAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM Annexure A4 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 16.02.2021 OF THIS HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL Annexure A5 TRUE COPY OF THE G.O(RT)NO.1231/2021/H&FWD DATED 10.06.2021 Annexure A6 TRUE COPY OF THE G.O(RT)NO.6931/2016/FIN DATED 22.08.2016 Annexure A7 TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT LETTER NO.1822540/INF.2/192/2021-FIN DATED 26.08.2021 Annexure A7(a) TRUE COPY OF THE NOTEFILE NO.H&L-B2/65/2016- FIN (E-172236) Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE AMENDED O.A NO.1585/2021 ALONG WITH ANNEXURES A1 TO A 6 Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE FOURTH RESPONDENT IN OA ON 22.11.2021 Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY CNR: KLHC010528592025 O.P.(KAT)No.274 of 2025 43 2026:KER:76132 THE SECOND RESPONDENT IN OA ON 25.02.2022 Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER TO THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE 2ND AND 4TH RESPONDENT ALONG WITH ANNEXURE A7 AND ANNEXURE A7(A) Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE MA NO.544/2023 FOR AMENDMENT OF THE OA Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE FOURTH RESPONDENT IN AMENDED OA ON 13.11.2023 Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE FIRST RESPONDENT ON 14.03.2024 Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 16.12.2024 IN OA NO.1585/2021