

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NUMBER 1555 OF 2002

THURSDAY, THIS THE 9th DAY OF JANUARY, 2003

HON'BLE MRS. MEERA CHHIBBER, MEMBER (J)

Smt. Kamala Devi
d/o Late Shri Bhagwan Din,
w/o Shri Suresh Chandra,
r/o Village Adampur,
Post Office -Athrampur,
District -Allahabad. Applicant
(By Advocate : Sri B.P. Yadav)

V E R S U S

1. Union of India through the General Manager,
Northern Railway, Railway Board,
Bareilly House,
New Delhi.
2. Mandal Railway Prabandhak Northern Railway,
Allahabad.

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri A.K. Gaur)

O R D E R

Hon'ble Mrs. Meera Chhibber, J.M.

..... This is the second round of
filed
litigation/by the applicant, who had earlier approached
this Tribunal in O.A. No.1477/1999 and the court was
pleased to pass a detailed order on 21.03.2001 whereby
the respondent No.2, Secretary Railway Board, Bareilly
was directed
House, New Delhi/ to consider the claim of the applicant
for payment of retiral benefits of her father and
arrears of Family Pension, if admissible, for her
mother. Similarly respondent No.3 was directed to



.....2/-

consider the prayer for grant of compassionate appointment and give a reasoned order. Both these directions to respondents Nos. 2 & 3 was to be complied within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

2. The applicant has stated that till date respondents have not passed any order but have only sent two cheques to the applicant, one for an amount of Rs.4,529/- vide cheque dated 13.02.2002 and the other amounting to Rs.33,642/- vide cheque dated 02.05.2002. But no break up of the amount has been given as to how this amount has been calculated and what has been paid to the applicant. It is rather unfortunate that inspite of Court's direction, the respondents are not taking the matter seriously. Once they had issued a cheque in favour of the applicant they ought to have given the break up ^{also to show B} as to how they have calculated the amount to ^{the B} tune of Rs.4,529/- and Rs.33,642/- and the amount is paid for what purpose so that she could have known, as to what is still due to her and could have atleast given a representation against that. I deprecate this kind of attitude of the respondents. However, keeping in view the fact that they have atleast sent the cheques to the applicant ^{already B} ~~and~~, the matter is remitted back to the ~~respondents~~ respondents once again directing them to comply with the directions as given in the earlier order dated 21.03.2001 within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and communicate the decision taken on the request of the applicant for compassionate appointment as well as give the full details and break up of the amount which has been given to the applicant by way of 2 cheques which is annexed with the O.A. In case, there is anything else which the respondents would like to explain they would be at liberty to explain it in the speaking order which ^{they B} are directed

B

to be passed now. It is made clear that if the directions as given now are not complied with within the stipulated period action would be taken against the respondents for not complying with the directions. Since the direction had already been given by the Tribunal in the earlier O.A., I do not think any purpose would be served by ^{keeping} ~~getting~~ this O.A. pending and waiting for the reply of the respondents. Therefore, this O.A. is being disposed off at the admission stage itself by reiterating the directions already given in the earlier O.A. and giving direction to the respondents to pass the reasoned order and give break up of the amount given to the applicant within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

3. With the above directions, the O.A. is disposed off finally. The applicant would be at liberty to revise this O.A. by filing an M.A. only, in case, the respondents do not ^{even now} comply with the direction given ~~this time~~.

MEMBER (J)

shukla/-