

To Respected K. Rajaraman ji, Secretary(Telecom),DoT, Sanchar Bhawan. New Delhi-110001

Sub: <u>An impassioned appeal to kindly consider as to how and in what context are different fitments</u> suggested by 3rd PRC being considered for Pension Revision on following legitimate grounds.

Ref: Our letter no SNPWA/ CHQ/ Secy(T)/ 3/23 Dated 6th April 23. Respected Sir,

In furtherance to our letter under reference, we submit following significant fact that cannot be ignored under Circumstances.

That 3rd PRC recommended different fitments for working employees of CPSUs, based on the affordability of the respective CPSUs. But in the case of those who were permanent Government employees and got absorbed in BSNL/MTNL in terms of Rule 37 A and are deemed as retired from Government Service, whose pension is paid by the Government, where and in what context is the question of affordability of the BSNL/ MTNL to pay to its working employees arise for applying these different fitments of 3rd PRC for Pension Revision, irrefutably other than 15%.

The two, in terms of above provision of Rule 37(A), have no relevance to each other and as such argument whether to extend 0%, 5%, or 10% for Pension Revision is completely redundant and has no basis in the context of the above provision. It has to be 15% the way 30% was extended for Pension Revision based on recommendations of 2nd PRC in 2011. This is a glaring precedent that cannot be overlooked in any case whatsoever.

We make a fervent appeal to your goodself to keep this crucial and inescapable fact into considerationwhiledecidingfitmentforourPensionRevision.Warm Regards

Sincerely yours

(G. L.Jogi)

Copy to:

- 1. Respected Shri Manish Sinha ji. Member (F) Our humble and impassioned appeal to your benign and gracious goodself is to kindly give due cognizance to the above significant and crucial provision of Rule 37(A).
- 2. Respected Shri U.S.Pandey ji, Member(S), for kind n/a pl.