

(9)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

OA-2116/93
MP-3074/93

New Delhi this the 12th Day of April, 1994.

Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)

1. Smt. Chanderkala,
W/o late Sh. Shiva Lal,
Ex-Bitter in Govt. of India
Press, Quarter No.107,
Type-II, Minto Road,
New Delhi.

2. Sh. Sanjay Kumar,
S/o late Sh. Shiva Lal
(Address as above)

Applicants

(Through Mrs. Sarla Chandra - None present)

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through the Secretary,
Ministry of Works and Urban
Development, Govt. of India.
2. Director, Directorate of Printing,
'B' Wing Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi.
3. Manager,
Govt. of India Press,
Minto Road,
New Delhi.
4. Estate Officer,
Govt. of India Press,
Minto Road,
New Delhi.

Respondents

(Ms. Protima Kumar Gupta, proxy counsel for
Sh. K.C. Mittal)

ORDER(ORAL)
delivered by Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)

The case has been taken in the revised list.

No one is present on behalf of the applicant. I,
therefore, proceed to decide this case on the basis
of the pleadings and the submissions made by the
learned proxy counsel for the respondents.

The husband of the applicant was employed as Binder in the Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi. While in service, he died on 9.7.1992. His widow applied for compassionate appointment of her second son on the ground that her first son even though employed was living separately and was not supporting the family. She is aggrieved by the ^{impugned} order dated 5.7.1993. The request of compassionate appointment of her son has been rejected.

In the counter filed on behalf of the respondents, the main averments are these. On the basis of the ^{4.2.92} judgement of this Tribunal in the case of Sh. Sanjay Kumar, a scheme has been prepared by the Press. The request of the applicant was examined in the light of the guidelines given in the scheme and this case was not found deserving one because the applicant has two sons and two daughters. Her elder son Sh. Bhagwan Das is married, employed and living with the applicant No.1 and 2. She is receiving a monthly pension of Rs.735 P.M. plus allowances. After the death of her husband she also received over Rs.1 lakh as terminal benefits.

In view of the clarifications given by the respondents, I hold that this is not a fit case ^{for} ~~interference~~ ^{by} the Tribunal. The O.A. is hereby rejected.

Parties to bear their own costs.

/vv/

B. N. Dhoundiyal
(B.N. DHOUNDIYAL)
MEMBER (A)