

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

(11)

OA-994/93

New Delhi this the 18th Day of April, 1994.

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

1. Smt. Chanderwati,
W/o late Sh. Chaman Lal,
R/o Quarter No.11/S/251, Ordnance
Factory Estate, Murad Nagar,
Distt. Ghaziabad.
2. Sh. Shiv Avtar,
S/o late Sh. Chaman Lal,
R/o Qr. No. S/251, Ordnance
Factory Estate, Murad Nagar,
(U.P.)

Applicants

(By advocate Sh. A.K. Bhardwaj)

versus

1. Union of India
through the Secretary,
Ministry of Defence Production,
Central Secretariate,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General,
Ordnance Factories,
No. 10 Auckland Road,
Calcutta.
3. The General Manager,
Ordnance Factory,
Murad Nagar,
Distt. Ghaziabad,
U.P.-201206.
4. The Estate Officer,
Ordnance Factory,
Murad Nagar, Distt. Ghaziabad.
U.P.

Respondents

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

There are two applicants; applicant No. 1
Smt. Chanderwati, widow of late Sh. Chaman Lal
who was working as Machinist in the Ordnance Fact
Distt. Ghaziabad, Applicant No. 2 Sh. Shiv Avtar
her son. They are aggrieved that compassionate

BN

(T2)

ment has been denied to them. Sh. Chaman Lal died on 19.4.1992. Thereafter the widow applied for compassionate appointment which according to the respondents was considered by the competent authority and it was found that the family was not in indigent condition.

The learned counsel for the applicant has contested the averments made by the respondents that two of her elder sons are earning members. He has clarified that these sons are living away from the family and they have their own family to support. He has also highlighted the fact that the applicant has to look after two minor daughters. However, it is clear that apart from having two elder sons who are living away, the widow has been paid an amount of Rs. 79000/- as terminal benefits and is receiving ~~monthly~~ ^{3m} pension of Rs. 1182/- + 582 as relief. Her case was considered by the competent authority and it is on these ground that it was rejected.

I hold that this is not a fit case for this Tribunal to interfere. The O.A. is, therefore, dismissed. It will, however, be open to the respon-
te consider the case of applicant No. 2 for ~~3m~~ appointment after he attains maturity.

No costs.

/vv/

B.N. Dhundiyal
(B.N. DHUNDIYAL
MEMBER (A))