

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

* * *

OA 2289/92

04.09.1992

Smt. Sushila Kumari

...Applicant

vs.

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

CORAM :

HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J)

For the Applicant

...Shri Ashok Aggarwal

For the Respondents

...None

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

(DELIVERED BY HON'BLE SHRI J.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J))

The applicant, Smt. Sushila Kumari is the daughter of a retiree, Shri Budh Ram, who was employed as a Lashkar in the Air Force Station, Tughlakabad under respondent No.2. It is averred that said Shri Budh Ram, during the course of his employment, was allotted Quarter No.T-6/3 Vayusenabad, New Delhi-110 062 and before his retirement in May, 1992, the daughter of the applicant already got an employment with the respondents and she is said to have been working since 1989 and is said to have been regularised w.e.f. 31.1.1991. It is also averred in the application that the applicant has not been paid any H.R.A. since August, 1991 and a document in proof thereof has been annexed with the OA at p-15 (Annexure F). The learned counsel for the applicant has been heard on admission. The representation has been made by the applicant

Le

...2...

in May, 1992 and also thereafter, but the respondents have not yet considered that representation for regularisation/allotment of the said quarter, said to be in occupation of the retiree along with the applicant. The learned counsel for the applicant did not annex any such rule with the application, but he stated that there has been a practice prevalent with the respondents to regularise the quarter in favour of a ward of a retiree, the ward is already sharing accommodation before the retirement of the Government servant. Since the applicant apprehends eviction from the said premises, the present application has been filed though there is no order against her.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant, it is given out that the representation of the applicant has not yet been disposed of and the mandatory period of six months has not expired. The application is, therefore, disposed of in the manner that the respondents shall dispose of the representation of the applicant, Smt. Sushila Kumari within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and till such time, the representation is not disposed of, the applicant shall not be dispossessed from the quarter No.T-6/3 Vayusenabad, New Delhi and amenities already being availed ^{of} _^ by her should not in any way be diminished. The applicant during this period shall continue on the same terms and conditions as she has occupied the quarter on the date of this order. If the applicant is still

3

aggrieved by the ultimate decision of the respondents, she may assail the same subject to the law of limitation in the competent forum. A copy of this order be given dasti.

J. P. Sharma

(J. P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)
04.09.1992