

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

...

OA.No.1187 of 1997

Dated New Delhi, this 27th day of August, 1997.

HON'BLE MR K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER(A)

(5)

Inderjit Singh  
S/o Late Kulwant Singh  
Sector VIII/572 R. K. Puram  
NEW DELHI.

... Applicant

By Advocate: Shri Manoj Chatterjee

versus

Union of India, through

A. Secretary,  
Ministry of Urban Affairs &  
Employment, Nirman Bhawan,  
NEW DELHI.

1. Directorate General of Works,  
Central Public Works Department,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
NEW DELHI,

2. Chief Engineer NDZ-I;  
C.P.W.D.,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
NEW DELHI.

3. Chief Engineer NDZ-II,  
C.P.W.D.,  
Nirman Bhawan  
NEW DELHI.

4. Executive Engineer-HQ,  
DCC - I, PWD Circle-I,  
C.P.W.D.,  
Nirman Bhawan  
NEW DELHI.

5. Superintendent Engineer,  
Co-ord. Circle (Civil),  
C.P.W.D.,  
I.T.O., I.P. Bhawan,  
NEW DELHI.

6. Directorate of Estates,  
Through Estate Officer,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
NEW DELHI.

... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri R. V. Sinha

ontd..2

O R D E R (Oral)

Mr K. Muthukumar, M(A)

6

Heard the learned counsel for the parties at the admission stage. As the issue involved is relatively a short one, <sup>is</sup> is being disposed of at the admission stage itself.

2. The applicant is ~~the~~ son of a deceased government employee Shri Kulwant Singh employed under the respondents as UDC, who died in harness and the widow of the employee has sought appointment of her son on compassionate grounds.

3. Shri R. V. Sinha appears for the respondents and prays for some time to file reply. But going through the pleadings, it is felt that this application can be disposed of at the admission stage. From the impugned order it is seen that the application for compassionate appointment has been rejected by the respondents. From the nature of the impugned order, it is evident that this is not a reasoned and speaking order and it is a case of plain rejection without assigning any reason. This OA is, therefore, disposed of with the following directions:-

The respondents are directed to consider the representation of the applicant dated May 24, 1996 and dispose of the same with a ~~detailed~~ reasoned and speaking order taking into account the relevant rules and guidelines on the subject, within a period of one month from the date of the receipt of a copy of this order.

4. The application is disposed of with the above directions reserving the liberty to the applicant to approach this Tribunal again in case he is further aggrieved by the orders of the respondents

on his representation. No order as to costs.

7



(K. Muthukumar)  
Member(A)

dbc