

Open Court

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD

Allahabad this the 10th day of October 2000.

Original Application no. 1202 of 1998

Hon'ble Mr. S.K.I. Naqvi, Judicial Member

1. Laxmi Narain Mauriya,  
S/o Basant Ram,  
R/o Village & Post Rohi,  
Tehsil Gyanpur,  
Distt. Bhadohi/Sant Ravi  
Das Nagar.
2. Smt. Gulab Devi,  
Widow of Late Basant Ram Maurya,  
R/o Village & Post  
Rohi, Tehsil Gyanpur,  
Distt. Bhadohi/Sant Ravi Das  
Nagar.

... Applicants

C/As Shri R.P. Singh  
Shri A.N. Mishra

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary  
Foreign Trade/ Finance.
2. Chairman, Export Inspection,  
Counsel.
3. The Joint C.C.E & I, New-  
Marine-Lines Bombay.
3. Joint Director General of  
Foreign Trade Bombay.

... Respondents

C/Rs Shri S. Mandhyan

Sew

// 2 //

O R D E R

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

Shri Basant Ram, father of applicant no. 1 and husband of applicant no. 2, died in harness on 12.09.1975 while in active service of respondents establishment. Shri Laxmi Narain Mauriya, applicant no. 1 applied for compassionate appointment and waited till 1998 and when he lost hope from the side of respondents he came before the Tribunal for direction to the respondents to provide him employment under dying-in-harness rules. As subsequent development in the matter, the applicant has filed RA which has been accepted today in the Court. In para 6 of the RA there is a mention that "when the applicant personally visited the office which was ~~in~~ kind enough to look into the record with regard to compassionate appointment of the applicant. It revealed that in view of earlier application, applicant was given appointment as early as on 21.12.77. The record showing the appointment is available in the office, unfortunately, <sup>the</sup> said appointment letter was neither received by the applicant nor he could have any knowledge of such appointment...." (Grammatical and typographical mistake in the original, have been mentioned above with correction as pointed out by learned counsel for the applicant.)

2. With the above position I find that the relief sought for by the applicant in the OA has

*See*

// 3 //

already been provided by the respondents. If under some circumstances he could not avail the same, he may approach the department concerned for which no direction is needed. *The departmental authority may consider the matter sympathetically*

3. The OA is decided accordingly with the above <sup>observation</sup> direction. There shall be no order as to costs.

*Saeenag*  
Member-J

/pc/