

**(OPEN COURT)**

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD**

This is the 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 330/00260 of 2021**

**HON'BLE MR. TARUN SHRIDHAR, MEMBER (A)**

Smt. Arishi Devi aged about 31 years, W/o Late Shri Arjun Singh Yadav, R/o 59 Satbari Yashoda Nagar, Kidwai Nagar, District Kanpur Nagar.

.....Applicant.

Advocates for the Applicant : Mr. Ashutosh Sharma

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Defence, South Block, Cabinet Secretariat, Raisina Hill, New Delhi 110 011.
2. The Director General Ordnance Factory Board, 10A Shaheed K Bose Road, District Kolkata 700001.
3. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Kalpi Road, Kanpur Nagar 208009.
4. Assistant Work Manager/Administration Ordnance Factory, Kalpi Road, Kanpur Nagar 208009.

.....Respondents

Advocate for the Respondents : Shri Chakrapani Vatsyayan

**O R D E R**

I have joined this Bench online through video conferencing.

2. Shri Ashutosh Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Chakrapani Vatsyayan, learned counsel for respondents, bot are present in court.
3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.
4. The limited prayer sought by the learned counsel for the applicant in this O.A. is appointment on compassionate grounds in the office of the respondents on

the ground that she is the legally wedded wife of late Arjun Singh Yadav, who was an employee of Ordnance Factory Board.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents objected the prayer of the applicant on the ground that sufficient evidence to prove that the applicant is a legal successor and legally wedded wife of the applicant, is not available and hence the respondents are not in a position to consider her representation.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the applicant draws attention to the document at page 32, which is the succession certificate issued by the competent civil court.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents points out, correctly so that document referred to by the learned counsel for the applicant cannot be considered to be a bonafide succession certificate for the purpose of employment in the respondents' organization as the scope of certificate is limited to the vestment of the movable property of the deceased employee.

8. Since the applicant had made representation in this regard, it would be appropriate to dispose of this representation at the initial stage with the direction to respondents to take a decision on her prayer for providing compassionate appointment in lieu of her husband in accordance with the rules and instructions governing the subject. The respondents are further directed to take a decision in the matter within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

9. It is made clear that I have not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case.

10. No order as to costs.

**(TARUN SHRIDHAR)**  
**Member (A)**

Manish/-