

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

O.A. No. 3632/2019

New Delhi, this the 20th day of December, 2019

Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)

Anju Bala,
 Aged about 39 years,
 W/o Late Sh. Kamal Kishore,
 R/o H. No. 376, Gali No.6,
 Vishkarma Colony Extn., Mithapur,
 Delhi. -Applicant

(through Sh. Shubham Gairola for Sh. M.K. Bhardwaj)

Versus

1. Union of India,
 Through its Secretary,
 Ministry of Home Affairs,
 North Block, New Delhi
2. The Joint Secretary (UT),
 Ministry of Home Affairs,
 North Block, New Delhi
3. UT Administration of Daman & Diu,
 Through its Administrator,
 Daman House, Chanakya Puri,
 New Delhi.
4. The Executive Engineer,
 PWD, Works Division-I, Daman
 Service to be affected through Resident
 Commissioner,
 UT (Admin) of Daman & Diu,
 Plot No.16, State Guest House,
 Chanakya Puri, New Delhi.





5. The Joint Resident Commissioner,
UT (Admin) of Daman & Diu,
Plot No.16, State Guest House,
Chanakya Puri, New Delhi. -Respondents

(through Sh. Rohit Serawat for Sh. Rajeev Kumar)

ORDER (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

2. The present OA has been filed by the applicant seeking the following reliefs:

- “i) To quash and set aside the impugned Letter/Order dated 25.10.2019 (A-1) and direct the respondents to consider the claim of applicant for appointment on compassionate grounds.
- ii) To declare the action of respondents in not considering the claim of applicant for compassionate appointment as illegal and issue appropriate directions to appoint the applicant on compassionate grounds forthwith.
- iii) To allow the OA with cost.
- iv) Any other orders may also be passed as this Hon’ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the existing facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Sh. Shubham Gairola, appeared as proxy counsel for the applicant and submitted that the respondents have passed an order dated 25.10.2019 on which, the applicant has submitted a representation dated 16.09.2019 (Annexure A-8). He further submits that the applicant would be satisfied if a direction is



issued to the respondents to decide upon the representation in a time bound manner.

4. Issue notice. Sh. Rohit Serawat, appearing as proxy counsel for Sh. Rajeev Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents, accepts notice.

5. Based on the submission made by the learned counsel for the applicant, the OA is disposed at the admission stage itself without going into the merits of the case with a direction to the respondents to consider the representation made by the applicant dated 16.09.2019 and decide upon it through a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, within two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)**

/ns/