

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

U.A. NO. 1054/92

DECIDED ON : 30-7-93

Jitender Kumar

... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

COURT :

THE HON'BLE MR. B. N. DHOONDIYAL, MEMBER (A)

Shri D. K. Gupta, Counsel for Applicant
Ms. Jasvinder Kaur for Shri Jog Singh,
Counsel for the Respondents

JUDGMENT

This C.A. has been filed by the applicant, Shri Jitender Kumar, against office memorandum dated 3.2.1992 rejecting his request for appointment on compassionate grounds, by the respondents. The applicant is the son of late Shri Karan Singh who had been working as Mono Operator in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, and died in harness leaving behind a family of five members - two sons and three daughters. The applicant has passed matriculation examination. He applied to the Manager, Government of India Press, New Delhi, for appointment on compassionate grounds in a Group 'C' post.

But The respondents rejected his request vide office memorandum dated 3.2.1992 stating that "at present there is no vacancy in the category of LDC/Copy Holder against which he can be accommodated." Aggrieved by the said memorandum, the applicant has approached this Tribunal praying for the above relief.

2. The respondents have contended that it is not possible to provide employment to the applicant as there is no vacancy in Group 'C' or 'D' category in the compassionate quota against which he can be accommodated. They have also referred to the directions of this Tribunal in an earlier case for

preparation of a scheme on all India basis to give relief in such cases to deserving persons.

3. A similar case was considered by a Bench of this Tribunal of which I was a Member in CCP-138/92 in OA-1417/90 decided on 16.4.1990. I reiterate the following observations made by the Tribunal in its order dated 16.4.1990 :-

"However, it is necessary to bear in mind that all cases for compassionate appointments must be dealt with on compassionate basis with utmost expedition. We do expect the authorities to bear this aspect in mind and make earnest effort to accommodate as many persons as possible by granting compassionate appointments in the respective cadres."

4. One peculiar feature of this case is that the respondents have not included the name of the applicant in the list prepared by them of candidates awaiting compassionate appointments. We see no reason as to why the name of the applicant should not be included in the said list and his case considered on merits along with that of others. The O.A. is disposed of with the above directions. No orders as to costs.

B.N.Dhondiyal
B. N. Dhondiyal
Member (A)

as