

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

OA 2109/98

New Delhi this the 22nd day of February, 2000

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

1. Puran Chand
Peon No. 4109
Safdarjung Hospital,
Ring Road, New Delhi-49

2. Smt. Sugni Devi,
135, Raj Nagar,
New Delhi.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Ashish Kalia)

Versus

1. Union of India, through
the Director of Estates,
Directorate of Estates,
New Delhi.

2. The Medical Superintendent
Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi-29

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Mrs. P.K. Gupta, learned
counsel through proxy counsel Sh.
Anil Singhal)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))


The applicant is aggrieved by the action of the respondents in not regularising Quarter No. 135, Raj Nagar which had been earlier allotted to his mother who had retired from service on 31.5.1996.

2. On retirement of applicant 2 from the service of Respondent 2 i.e. Safdarjung Hospital, they have issued letter dated 6.3.97 cancelling the allotment of that quarter to applicant 2 on 30.9.1996. Applicant 1 who is ^{the son} of applicant 2 has been in service with R-2 as Peon on regular basis w.e.f. 27.1.1989. The respondents have taken a plea that the aforesaid quarter which had been earlier allotted to his mother cannot be regularised in the name of applicant 1 because he is entitled for accommodation from ^{the} different Pool, namely, General Pool Accommodation, whereas the mother had been allotted the quarter

(A/B) (P)

from the Safdarjung Hospital Pool. Their contention is that such a change of the quarter is not permissible and, therefore, the applicant is not entitled for regularisation of the quarter. One of the grounds taken by the applicant is that certain other similarly situated persons who were also Peons have been given regularisation of their quarters, details of which are given in para 4.6. To this, the respondents have replied that the details of accommodation mentioned by the applicant pertain to Safdarjung Hospital Pool and not the General Pool Accommodation which is ^{the} main issue in this case. Nothing has been placed on record by the applicant to show that the contention of the respondents is erroneous or not based on relevant Rules. Therefore, the claim of the applicant for a direction to the respondents to consider his case for inter pool exchange of Quarter No. 135, Raj Nagar for another accommodation in the Safdarjung Hospital Pool does not appear to be tenable.

3. In the facts and circumstances of the case, I find no merit in this application and the same is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.


(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)