

Open Court

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 253 of 1996

Allahabad this the 19th day of December, 2000

Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

Vishnu Chaturvedi, aged about 40 years, Son of Late Shri Baboo Lal Chaubey, resident of 153 Inside Unnao Gate, Jhansi.

Applicant

By Advocate Shri R.K. Nigam

Versus

1. Union of India through Director Post and Telegraph, U.P., Lucknow.
2. Superintendent, R.M.S.'X' Division, Jhansi-284001.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Km. Sadhna Srivastava

O R D E R (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

Shri Vishnu Chaturvedi-applicant has come up seeking relief to the effect that the respondents be directed to consider the petitioner for his appointment in Group 'C' cadre on compassionate ground.

2. As per applicant's case, Shri Baboo Lal Chaubey is adopter father, who died in harness on 06.8.1993 leaving behind the applicant as the

SC

only surviving dependent adopted son. The applicant moved for appointment on compassionate ground but, he was not provided with any job, therefore, he has come up before the Tribunal seeking above directions.

3. The respondents have contested the case on the ground of entitlement of the applicant.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The applicant has failed to establish that he was the adopted son of deceased-Baboo Lal Chaubey and vide application dated 24.3.1995, the applicant Shri Vishnu Chaturvedi has described the deceased-Baboo Lal Chaubey as his uncle. The respondents have also filed the relevant service record of deceased-Baboo Lal Chaubey in which he has nowhere described the applicant as his adopted son, inspite of the fact that he made him as nominee to receive the service settlement made after his death. There is clear contention by Km.S. Srivastava that nephew does not come within the zone of consideration for compassionate appointment as per relevant rule in this regard. Nothing otherwise shown or referred from the side of the applicant.

6. For the above, I find no merit in the O.A. which is dismissed accordingly. No order as to costs.

Sic et al
Member (J)