

3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 185 of 1993

Date of Decision: 18.3.1994

Prafulla Kumar Sahoo

Applicant(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondent(s)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? *no*
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals ? *no*

*by 18.3.94*  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

9

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 185 of 1993

Date of Decision: 18.3.1994

Prafulla Kumar Sahoo                      Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others                      Respondents

For the applicant

M/s. Devanand Misra  
Deepak Misra  
A. Deo, B.S. Tripathy  
P. Panda, Advocates

For the respondents

Mr. Ashok Mishra,  
Sr. Standing Counsel  
(Central)

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE - CHAIRMAN

JUDGMENT

MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN: In this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the petitioner prays to quash the order passed by the competent authority contained in Annexures-4 and 6 and to direct the opposite parties to give the minimum amount of financial assistance to the petitioner.

2. The petitioner, while working as Signaler in the Postal Department met <sup>with</sup> an accident and was in a serious condition. The petitioner is said to have spent some money in his treatment. The petitioner's <sup>by</sup> claim for reimbursement having been denied this application has been filed with the aforesaid prayer.

3. In their counter the opposite parties maintain that the case is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.

lv

The fact that the petitioner met an accident and was seriously suffering was not disputed in the counter. But it was urged by Mr. Ashok Mishra, learned Senior Standing Counsel that payment can be made to the petitioner legitimately when he files documents to indicate the expenses he has incurred according to rules for his treatment. The petitioner not having done so, rightly his claim was rejected.

4. Mr. B.S. Tripathy, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner will now file another representation enclosing thereto the necessary documents. Direction be given to the opposite parties to consider the same. I have no objection if a representation is made to the competent authority by the petitioner and also necessary documents are filed to convince the authorities that a particular amount was incurred by the petitioner for his treatment. I hope and trust the competent authority would dispose of the same as per rules within a <sup>short</sup> ~~stipulated~~ period. Thus the application is accordingly disposed of.

No costs.

  
18.3.94  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Cuttack Bench Cuttack  
dated the 18.3.1994/ B.K. Sahoo