

(9)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Principal Bench, New Delhi

O.A.297/93

New Delhi, This the 14th Day of February 1994

Hon'ble Shri P.T. Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

1. Smt Anchi Devi Widow of Nathu Ram
2. Shri Ram Singh S/o Shri Raghu Bir Singh
Resident of F-238, Raj Nagar II
Palam Colony New Delhi.

By Advocate Shri M K Gaur

....Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India Through The General Manager
Western Railway, Church gate, Bombay
2. The Secretary
Railway Board, Rail Bhawan
New Delhi.
3. The Division Railway Manager
Western Railway, Jaipur.

...Respondents

By Nono

O R D E R (oral)

Hon'ble Shri P.T. Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

1. This OA has been filed with a prayer for direction to the respondents to consider the applicant No.2 for compassionate appointment and for any other relief deemed fit and proper.
2. Counter in this OA has not been filed in spite of number of opportunities given to the respondents. ^{No one} None has appeared on behalf of the respondents on 8.12.93 and 22.12.93 when the case was listed.
3. The case is being disposed of based on material contained in the OA and arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant.
4. It is the plea of the applicant that her husband who was working as Peintman in the Railways died on 7.7.80. Her family is in indigent circumstances and at the time of death of the employee the only member of the family other than the widow ^{minor} was her daughter. Subsequently she ^(the daughter) got

...2/

10

married and a representation was made by the widow ^{requesting for} claiming ₂ compassionate appointment for the son-in-law. This representation was turned down by the Divisional Railway Manager, Jaipur vide E891/90/71 dated 17.12.91 stating that there is no provision in the rules for granting compassionate appointment to sons-in-law. At this the applicant No.1 submitted a further representation dated 1.8.92 for consideration of her daughter's case for compassionate appointment. It is the case of the applicant that this representation has still not ~~yet~~ been disposed off.

5. In the circumstances of the case, it will be fit and proper to direct the respondents to dispose of the representation given by applicant No.1 on 1.8.92 claiming compassionate appointment for her daughter. Though the main relief claimed is for compassionate appointment for applicant No.2, ~~while~~ at the time of argument the learned counsel for the applicant sought direction that the respondent may be directed to consider the pending representation of applicant No.1.

6. The applicant No.1 is given another opportunity to file a fresh representation to the respondents within one month from the receipt of this order and thereafter the respondents are directed to give a reasoned reply to applicant No.1 within three months from the date of ^{receipt} ~~reply~~ of this representation. With the above direction the DA is disposed off. No costs.

P. J. Thiruvengadam

(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)
Member (A)

LCP