

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.1079/2000

Friday, this the 9th day of February, 2001

(8)

HON'BLE SHRI S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (A)

Shri Sunil Kumar
S/O Late Shri Dal Chand
R/O Village Nithari
Sector-31, Noida
Distt. Gautambudh Nagar, UP

(By Advocate: Shri Om Prakash Sharma) ..Applicant.

VERSUS

1. Delhi Jal Board
through its Chief Executive Officer,
VarunAlaya Phase-II
Jhandewalan Karol Bagh,
New Delhi.
2. The Chairman
Delhi Jal Board,
Office of Chief Minister,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Old Secretaries, Civil Lines,
Delhi
3. Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
through its Chief Secretary,
Old Secretaries, Civil Lines,
Delhi.

(By Advocate: Ms. Aarti Bansal) ..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

This is an application for appointment on compassionate ground filed by one of the sons, namely, Shri Sunil Kumar of the deceased employee (Shri Dal Chand) who was at the time of his death on 17.11.1996 still in service.

2. Following the death of Shri Dal Chand, Smt. Bhagwati wife of the deceased employee has filed a detailed representation before the Chief Executive Officer of the Delhi Jal Board on 17.9.1999 requesting for the

2
an

(2)

appointment of the aforesaid Shri Sunil Kumar on compassionate grounds. This was followed by a legal notice again served on the aforesaid respondent as also on the Chairman, Delhi Jal Board as well as the Chief Secretary, Govt. of NCT of Delhi on 12.1.2000. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the respondents have not cared to consider and decide the matter so far.

3. At this stage of dictation of this order, the learned counsel for the respondents appeared and sought to intervene on the issue of jurisdiction. Earlier, the learned counsel for the applicant has argued that this Tribunal has jurisdiction over the Delhi Jal Board on the ground that the said Board is a statutory body under the control of the Govt. of NCT of Delhi. The learned counsel for the respondents has placed reliance, however, on the provisions of Rule 14 (2) of Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 to contend that this Tribunal does not have jurisdiction over the Jal Board. I have perused the aforesaid provision and have also seen the Govt. of India's notifications listed at pages 41 and 42 of Swamy's compilation of CAT Act, 7th Edition, 1994. The said list contains the names of eight different institutions/bodies which have been brought under the purview of the Tribunal. The name of Delhi Jal Board does not figure in this. Accordingly, it is abundantly clear that the jurisdiction of this Tribunal does not extend to Delhi Jail Board.

4. In the circumstances, I find myself unable to proceed further with this OA. The learned counsel for the

(3)

10
The applicant agrees to withdraw the application. He will be at liberty to approach an appropriate forum for the redressal of the grievance disclosed in the present OA.

5. Present OA is dismissed as withdrawn. No costs.

S.A.T. Rizvi
(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

/sunil/