



2026:AHC:24325-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 1623 of 2026

Smt. Seeta Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal Allahabad Bench
and 4 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Deo Prakash Singh, Rishi Kumar Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Agam Narain Roy, Shakshi Shukla, Ramesh Kumar Shukla

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition is directed against order dated 10.10.2025 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench, Allahabad, whereby Original Application ('O.A.') filed by the petitioner seeking interest on the arrears of pension has been dismissed.
2. The petitioner had earlier filed O.A. No. 871 of 2023 seeking grant of pension along with interest. The said O.A. came to be decided on 07.08.2024, directing the respondents to make payment of the pension along with arrears, however, no direction for payment of interest was made by the Tribunal. Pursuant to the direction of the Tribunal, payment was made to the petitioner. Whereafter, fresh O.A. was filed seeking payment of interest on the arrears of the pension received by her.
3. The Tribunal, after hearing the parties, came to the conclusion that when specific prayer was made in the earlier O.A. seeking grant of interest and the same was not ordered, it would be deemed that the Tribunal did not allow the interest and therefore, filing of the second O.A. for the same purpose, cannot be permitted and consequently, dismissed the same. Feeling aggrieved, the present petition has been filed.
4. Counsel for the petitioner made submissions that the respondents were not justified in not paying the interest on the arrears of pension as the petitioner was entitled to the payment of pension/arrears at least from the

year 2020 and for no fault of her, she was deprived of the pension and therefore, the respondents are liable to make payment of interest.

5. Counsel for the respondents supported the order impugned.

6. We have considered the submissions made and have perused the material available on record.

7. It is not in dispute that in O.A. No. 871 of 2023 filed by the petitioner, a specific prayer for payment of interest on arrears was made and the Tribunal, in its order passed on 07.08.2024, did not direct payment of interest.

8. Once the order was passed in the earlier O.A. wherein reliefs *inter alia* pertaining to interest was sought and the same was not granted, the remedy open for the petitioner was to question the validity of the said order, however, no challenge was laid to the said order. However, once the order was implemented and the payment was made to the petitioner, fresh O.A. was filed seeking payment of interest.

9. Once a prayer made in an earlier O.A. has not been granted, filing of a fresh O.A. seeking the relief, which was not granted in the earlier O.A., cannot be countenanced.

10. There is no substance in the petition, the same is therefore, **dismissed**.

(Kshitij Shailendra, J) (Arun Bhansali, CJ)

February 4, 2026

AHA/Sazia