

**DR. N. C. SAXENA, COMMISSIONER AND
HARSH MANDER, SPECIAL COMMISSIONER OF THE SUPREME COURT
IN THE CASE: PUCL v. UOI & Ors. WRIT PETITION (Civil) No. 196 of 2001**

September 23rd, 2009.

Pension Revision/685/M.P.

Shri. P C Sarma
Chief Secretary
Government of Assam
New Secretariat
Dispur
Assam.

Sub: Regarding the revision in the amount of pension given under IGNOAPS.

Dear Shri. Sarma,

As you are aware, in our capacity as Commissioners of the Supreme Court in CWP 196/2001, PUCL v. UOI and others, we monitor the implementation of the food and employment related schemes in the country which fall under the purview of the case including the ICDS, MDMS, NREGA, IGNOAPS, TPDS, NMBS/JSY and NFBS.

We would like to draw your attention towards the major improvements in the IGNOAPS in the last two years. In March 2006, the Government of India, after a decade, increased its contribution into pension from Rs. 75 to Rs. 200 and recommended that each state should make attempts to raise their contribution to a level that is at least on par with it. This would mean that each state government should further contribute at least Rs. 200 into the pension of each beneficiary to make it a total of at least Rs. 400 per month. Secondly, In November 2007 the Government of India universalized the benefits of this scheme among all the old people who are BPL and above 65 years of age.

However, it is learnt that the state of Madhya Pradesh is still providing only Rs. 275 per month as old age pension under the IGNOAPS to the old people who are BPL and above 65 years. This means that the state contribution to a programme which is critical to survival of most vulnerable groups is only 75 Rs. per beneficiary per month. The old age pension scheme is the only protection and social security scheme available for the most vulnerable group of old people. More than three years after the Government of India revised and increased their contribution into the pension, therefore we would request you to kindly make a revision in the amount of old age pension provided in your state and increase it to at least Rs. 400 per month, which would include Rs. 200 from the Government of India. This has been done by many states and even some

**DR. N. C. SAXENA, COMMISSIONER AND
HARSH MANDER, SPECIAL COMMISSIONER OF THE SUPREME COURT
IN THE CASE: PUCL v. UOI & Ors. WRIT PETITION (Civil) No. 196 of 2001**

states are providing more than Rs. 400 as pension per month presently, including Maharashtra, Delhi and Goa.


We are sure that the State government would have already universalised the benefits of this scheme among all the old people who are BPL and above 65 years of age, in view of the recent revision of November 2007 in the scheme. We would like to request you please send us the information on the estimates and coverage of old people under the state pension scheme (if any) and IGNOAPS separately for the last three years including 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09, in the format below.

Year	State Pension Scheme		IGNOAPS	
	Estimate of eligible beneficiaries	No. of beneficiaries covered	Estimate of eligible beneficiaries	No. of beneficiaries covered
2006-07				
2007-08				
2008-09				


We would also like to request you please put the names of all beneficiaries under IGNOAPS in the public domain on a website and apprise us about the same. The state government of Uttar Pradesh did it, which led to unearthing of a big scam, whereby a large number of beneficiaries were neither old nor poor. Please also enclose a copy of the instructions issued in this direction.

We would be very grateful if the State government could please give it an utmost priority in their agenda and apprise us about the same at the earliest.

With Regards,



Dr. N.C. Saxena



Harsh Mander