

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

O.A.No.1994/95

(15)

Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this 18th day of October, 1996

1. Chanderpal  
s/o Shri Ram Kishan  
r/o House No.505, School Block  
Shakarpur  
New Delhi.

2. Vidhya Devi  
w/o Late Shri Ram Kishan  
(T.No.1550/IF)  
r/o House No.505,  
School Block  
Shakarpur  
Delhi.

.... Applicants

(None)

Vs.

1. Union of India : through  
The Secretary  
Defence Production  
(Ordnance Factory)  
Central Secretariate  
South Block  
New Delhi.

2. The Director General  
Ordnance Factories  
No.10 Auckland Road  
Calcutta  
West Bengal.

3. The General Manager  
Ordnance Factory  
Muradnagar  
Uttar Pradesh  
Distt. Ghaziabad.

... Respondents

(By Shri V.S.R.Krishna, Advocate)

O R D E R

Shri R.K.Ahooja, Hon'ble Member(A)

This application has been filed seeking directions to respondents to offer compassionate appointment to Applicant No.1, Shri Chandra Pal, whose father died in harness on 19.2.1993, after rendering approximately 30 years of service with respondent No.3.

O/o

(16)

2. The respondents in their reply have stated that the request for compassionate appointment was rejected after considering the circumstances of the case.

3. Today, when the matter came up for hearing, none appeared on behalf of the applicant. I have, however, heard the learned counsel for respondents and I have carefully gone through the pleadings.

4. The case of the applicants is that the deceased government employee left behind family consisting of a widow, two sons and two unmarried daughters. <sup>They</sup> ~~He~~ states that the pension which has been granted to the widow is paltry and the terminal benefits which have been granted amounting to Rs.1,26,111/- (approximately) are insufficient for the various liabilities of a family including the marriage of the daughters. Therefore applicants claim that the conditions of the family being difficult the respondents are bound to grant compassionate appointment to Applicant No.1 in terms of the Government instructions dated 30.6.1987, 28.9.1992 and 20.8.1993.

5. I have considered the matter carefully. The respondents have stated that the widow is receiving a pension of Rs.1391/- per month. Further more, the family has received an amount of Rs.1,26,111/- (approximately) as terminal benefits. Besides two of the three sons are married. Further more, the applicant No.1 is also married and living

dr

(17)

seperately. In view of this, there is no basis for grant of compassionate appointment as the family cannot be said to be in indigent circumstances. In the rejoinder, these facts are not denied by the applicant even though amounts involved are, it is pleaded insufficient for the family.

6. Be that as it may, it is not for the Tribunal to intervene by way of judicial review once it is found that the competent authority has duly considered the circumstances of the family of the deceased employee. I find that in the present case, the respondents have given due consideration to the claims of the applicants.

7. In the light of the above discussion, the application is dismissed. No costs.

*R.K.Ahooja*  
(R.K.AHOOJA)  
MEMBER(A)

/rao/