

3
②
2

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 434 of 1993

Date of Decision: *January 18, 1994.*

Debasis Patnaik

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 *NO* Central Administrative Tribunals or not ?

Jan 18/94.
VICE-CHAIRMAN

3

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 434 of 1993

Date of Decision: 18.1.1994.

Debasis Patnaik

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

For the applicant

M/s. K.P. Mishra,
S. Mallick,
B.K. Sahoo,
A. Das,
N. Sarkar,
P.K. Mohapatra,
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 for an appointment on compassionate ground.

2. Petitioners' father Shri Krishna Kalakar Patnaik while functioning as Chief Agricultural Officer in Dandakarany Development Project died on 9.3.1985. On October, 13, 1987, the petitioner had made an application for compassionate appointment. Prayer of the petitioner having been rejected this Bench has been approached.

3. In their counter the opposite parties maintain that since the Dandakaranya Development Project has been wound up from 1982 pursuant to a policy decision taken by the Government of India, all recruitment including appointment on compassionate ground were banned and thus there was no



4

2

scope for compassionate appointment.

4. I have heard Mr. A. Das, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Ashok Mishra, learned Standing Counsel. Since the Dandakaranya Development Project has already been wound up and several persons are deployed to the surplus cell for being adjusted in any other organisations, rightly it was not possible on the part of the concerned authority to give an appointment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds. This is a most unfortunate case. But circumstances stand on the way of the petitioner. It cannot be helped ~~possible~~ in any manner whatsoever.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances stated above, I find no merit in this petition which stands dismissed leaving the parties to bear their own costs.


18.1.94
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal
Cuttack Bench Cuttack
dated the 18.1.1994/B.K.Sahoo

