

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001
Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

Dated: 06.06.2018

To

The Convenor
U.F.B.U.

Dear Comrade

100% D.A. NEUTRALISATION TO PRE-NOVEMBER 2002 PENSIONERS & IMPROVEMENT IN FAMILY PENSION SCHEME @ 30% OF BASIC PAY

We wish to invite your kind reference to the record note dated 25.05.2015 between IBA and UBFU constituents wherein the pending issues of retirees were listed along with the response of IBA. The response of IBA in respect of these two issues is furnished below for a ready reference:

1. 100% D.A. NEUTRALISATION TO PRE-NOVEMBER 2002 PENSIONERS

IBA's response: "the matter is sub judice as certain cases on this issue are pending for a decision with Supreme Court. As such IBA cannot take a decision on this issue at this stage. From a humanitarian point of view, IBA may examine feasibility of providing 100% dearness relief neutralisation to pre-November 2002 retirees based on a detailed costing exercise".

2. IMPROVEMENT IN FAMILY PENSION SCHEME @ 30% OF BASIC PAY:

IBA's response: "While the IBA is sympathetic to the issue, the cost involved is significant and unaffordable at the present juncture. IBA will examine cost implications and sustainability of each Bank at a future date".

In this backdrop, we the apex organisations of bank pensioners and retirees representing 100% membership, would like to request you to take up the above two issues on priority with IBA and help the retirees in getting these two issues resolved at the earliest. In this connection we also furnish the inputs/details about both the issues for your consideration and taking up with IBA.

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001
Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

100% D.A. NEUTRALISATION TO PRE-NOVEMBER 2002 PENSIONERS

The honourable Supreme Court has disposed off the issue on 16th May 2018 and now it is no longer sub judice. The writ petitions in the honourable High Courts at Madras and Calcutta were initially filed by the individual aggrieved members and affiliate of the apex organisation. However, when the matter came in appeal before the honourable Supreme Court, our apex organisations also intervened so as to extend financial and logistic support for effective coordination with the senior advocates. The retirees supported by the organisations of retirees have lost the case in Supreme Court. But we are of the considered view that it was a bad loss. We recapitulate the observations of the honourable bench of the Supreme Court after completion of arguments by the parties to the case hereunder:

- i) That this court has already dismissed the appeals of the retirees against the order of High Court of Madras on similar issue and there cannot be two different and contradictory judgements by this court on the same matter.
- ii) That the court suggested the senior advocates representing the appellants and the respondents three options viz.
 - a) The court recalls the earlier order in case of Madras High Court appeals and then passes a fresh order in this case.
 - b) That this case is referred to a larger bench for disposal;
 - c) The appellants in case of Madras High Court order file review petitions which will be tagged with this case after condoning the delay and heard in this court.

A careful reading of the observations made by the honourable bench of Supreme Court would give a clear and unambiguous impression that the case was tilted towards the retirees. In furtherance to these observations, all the appellants in case of Madras High Court filed their review petitions which were tagged with the case of United Bank of India after condoning the delay. The case was heard on 23rd August 2017 and the judgement was reserved. Ultimately the long awaited judgement was pronounced in the court 16.05.2018 by allowing the appeals of the management of United Bank of India, setting aside the judgements and orders of the honourable High Court of Calcutta and dismissing the writ petition no. 507 of 2012 preferred by the respondents viz. United Bank of India Retirees Welfare Association and others. We have undertaken a detailed analysis of the Supreme Court judgement dated 16.05.2018 thereby bringing out the merits in favour of the retirees and inaccuracies and inconsistencies which crept into the detailed

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001
Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

order of the honourable Supreme Court. A detailed analytical note is enclosed.

IMPROVEMENT IN FAMILY PENSION SCHEME @ 30% OF BASIC PAY

While the pensioners of RBI and Government have the facility of uniform family pension @ 30% of Basic Pay, the Bank pensioners are allowed 15% of the Basic Pay with an upper ceiling fixed for such family pension. Consequently the family pensioners of the deceased bank employees including the spouses of General Managers/Executive Directors/Chairmen & Managing Directors are getting a pension ranging from as low as Rs. 4000 to a maximum of Rs. 14000 depending on the date of retirement, the cadre and the grade of the retiree. It is painful that the family pensioners are expected to pay their medical premium to the extent of Rs. 40000 annually under the IBA's Medical Insurance Scheme for the retirees, thereby leaving nothing for their sustenance. **It is worth mentioning that the banks employees and officers were given the facility of pension in lieu of Contributory Provident Fund, but the provision of post retiral medical insurance at a high premium has led to some of the family pensioners virtually ending up getting medical insurance in lieu of family pension.** It sounds ironically cruel! The issue of restoring family pension parity at par with Government and RBI family pensioners @ 30% of Basic Pay is an emotive issue and deserves to be settled urgently on humanitarian grounds, the cost implications notwithstanding.

We also request you to arrange a meeting between the leaders of UFBU and the apex organisations of the retirees so that we can present and discuss our case with the leaders of UFBU at an early date. The bankers of yester years who are senior and super senior citizens and have immensely contributed for the growth of the banking industry fondly look towards the leadership of UFBU for early resolution of these long pending issues.

With comradely regards,

Yours comradely,

(A.Ramesh Babu)

Joint Convenors, CBPRO

(K.V. Acharya)

(S.C. Jain)

General Secretary, AIBRF

Encl: one

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001

Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

Enclosure to letter dated 06.06.2018

1. The Honourable Court has analysed the issue of D.A. neutralisation as per tapered method at different rates vis-a-vis 100% neutralisation and made observations in paras 21 to 25. The analysis under para 21 is erroneous in as much as the issue was not that whatever benefit was enjoyed by the employees who retired before November 2002 with tapered methodology of D.A. neutralisation was taken away, it was rather the improvement in D.A. neutralisation from tapered to 100% as allowed to those employees who retired after November 2002 was not extended to those who retired before November 2002. Since all the retirees constituted a homogenous group and were getting D.A. neutralisation under tapered methodology, creating an arbitrary classification by fixing 1.11.2002 as cut off date for extending the benefit of 100% neutralisation was not only discriminatory but also violative of the principle laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of D.S. Nakara.

2. The Division Bench relied on the judgement in case of Kallakkurichi Taluk Retired Officials Association, Tamil Nadu while observing that the dearness relief is relatable to the cost of living index and varies in direct proportion to the same. It must be borne in mind that dearness relief is an amount paid to the retirees to neutralize the astronomical rise in prices. The object of paying dearness relief is the same irrespective of the date on which the employee retires. Inflation hits the employees who retire before the cut off date as hard as it does those who retire later. Therefore dearness relief cannot be different to two sets of retirees. Holding the distinctions between the pre November 2002 retirees and post November 2002 retirees to be unreasonable, arbitrary and discriminatory. The Division Bench directed the Bank to pay dearness relief to all pensioners at the same rate. It is beyond comprehension as to how such a reasoned and merited judgement could be set aside by disregarding the principles held in case of D.S. Nakara and Kallakkurichi Taluk Retired Officials Association, Tamil Nadu.

3. It was held in case of D.S. Nakara that if the State considered it necessary to liberalise the pension scheme, we find no rationale principle behind it for granting these benefits only to those who retired subsequent to that date simultaneously denying the same to those who retired prior to that date. If the liberalisation was considered necessary

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001

Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

for augmenting social security in old age to the government servants, then those who retired earlier cannot be worse off than those who retired later. The artificial division has absolutely no nexus to the objects sought to be achieved by liberalising the pension scheme. It is thus clear that 100% D.A. neutralisation being a liberalisation and improvement with regard to calculation of D.A. to the retired employees cannot be denied to one set of retirees on the basis of any artificial and arbitrary classification by stipulating a cut off date. It was also observed that for the purpose of revised computation of D.A. according to liberalised formula was to extend the benefit of improvement to all existing retirees irrespective of the date of their retirement as they constitute one class and any further division within that class being impermissible.

4. It was held in case of D.S. Nakara that there could be justification in making a distinction between two sets of retirees and limiting the new retiral benefit to those who retired after the cut off date. But in this case the change in the methodology of neutralisation of D.A. from tapered basis to 100% is an improvement and not a new retiral benefit. Hence an arbitrary and artificial classification based on a cut off date violates the principle held in case of Nakara
5. The Honourable Supreme Court has shown an oblivion to the fact that the percentage of D.A. at 0.18% with 100% neutralisation for the present slabs of 1065 works out to 191.70% whereas if the percentage was to be calculated on the basis of tapered methodology for 0.18% upto Rs. 9650 plus 0.15% above Rs. 9650 and upto Rs. 15350 plus 0.09% above Rs. 15350 and upto Rs. 16350 plus 0.04% above Rs.16350, the D.A. percentage would be lower at 162.95%. The similar difference would arise in case of pre November 2002 retirees and hence their effective percentage of D.A. being lower under tapered method would hurt them as they will be denied D.A. on that component of D.A. which is merged with Basic Pay with effect from 01.11.2002 (2288 points). The differential treatment to the pre November 2002 retirees by not extending the benefit of 100% D.A. neutralisation would result in their drawing lesser pension to the extent of Rs. 4368 as illustrated in case of Santipriya Roy on page 16-17 of the order of the Honourable Supreme Court. In face of such facts the observations by the Honourable Supreme Court on Page 35 of the order that it could possibly be said that for those who are with the Basic Pension in the region of Rs. 6000 on the basis of tapering formula may well, in the

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001

Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

ultimate analysis, average to the same level of 0.18% are erroneous as it fails to recognise the fact of merger of D.A. at 2288 points with Basic Pay in case of post November 2002 retirees and thus becoming eligible for computing D.A. and yielding higher quantum in absolute terms. In this backdrop the observations made in para 23 of the judgement are based on erroneous understanding of the methodology of calculating D.A. using tapered rates of neutralisation vis-a-vis calculating D.A. at 100% neutralisation for the entire amount of Basic Pension.

6. The observations by the court that neither the rate of 0.18% can be applied as it would cause great harm and damage to the retirees nor a flat rate of 0.24% can be applied for entire amount of Basic Pension falls short of any rationale or reasonableness. Their assumption that adopting a flat rate of 0.24% as prayed for the retirees who retired before 01.11.2002 will confer better rate than those employees who retired after 01.11.2002 undermines the fact of merger of D.A. at 2288 points for post November 2002 retirees. The merger of D.A. with Basic Pay would help them get higher quantum of Basic Pension resulting in higher amount of D.A. in absolute terms even at 0.18% neutralisation. Their further observations under para 24 that it would be extremely difficult and hazardous to adopt a flat rate as is sought to be projected defies logic and common sense as 100% neutralisation at 0.18% is neither difficult nor hazardous then how 100% neutralisation at 0.24% could be termed as extremely difficult and hazardous.
7. The Pension Scheme in the Bank did not become unworkable by changing the methodology of D.A. neutralisation from tapered slabs to 100% in case of those who retired post November 2002 then how it could be assumed that adopting the same methodology by changing the neutralisation of D.A. formula from tapered slab basis to 100% would make the scheme unworkable. A reference to the cases of P.N. Menon and others and Indian Ex-Service League and others under para 25 of order are irrelevant and out of context. When tapering formula was done away with by R.B.I. for all the retirees without any artificial classification based on cut off date and has been working smoothly and successfully, the apprehensions as mentioned in the order are unfounded.
8. As regards taking the settlement as a package deal in totality we are of the view that the settlement did not mention any cut off date to classify the retirees into pre and post November 2002. Hence the assumptions

**COORDINATION OF BANK PENSIONERS' AND RETIREES ORGANISATIONS
AND
ALL INDIA BANK RETIREES' FEDERATION**

J-208, Vijay Rattan Vihar, Sector-15, Part II, Gurgaon-122001

Tel: 01244270198 Mob: 9868220338

of rejecting the settlement in part is arbitrary. The Honourable Court has shown a complete oblivion to the fact that IBA arbitrarily created this discriminatory classification by means of a separate letter dated 28.06.2005 and not through any settlement between the parties.

9. The alibi that a sum of Rs. 1288 crores per annum was agreed in the settlement towards all the benefits and any stepping up of benefit for a section of employees (100% D.A. neutralisation to pre 2002 retirees) is bound to inflate the figure is an untenable and weak argument as the order itself observes that this by itself was not a ground that weighed with them. It is abundantly clear that the amount of Rs. 1288 crores did not and can not include the cost of future increase in D.A.

10. The observations of the Honourable Court that having confirmed the decision of the Division Bench of Madras High Court the matter stood closed (para 26) are inexplicable in as much as its earlier order confirming the decision of the Madras High Court stood open consequent to filing of review petitions by the aggrieved parties as mentioned in the earlier paragraph on page no. 2.