

4

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK.

Original Application No. 169 of 1994

Date of Decision: June 24, 1994.

Smt. Gandhi Dhobi and another ... Applicants

Versus

Union of India & Others ... Respondents

Original Application No. 170 of 1994

Smt. M. B. Maji and another ... Applicants

Versus

Union of India & Others ... Respondents

Date of decision:

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to the reporters or not?
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not?


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

(K. P. ACHARYA)
VICE CHAIRMAN

24 JUN 94.

5

5

VS.

...

Original Application No.170 of 1994

Vs.

...

.... Mr. Ashok Chakraborty,
Advocate.

.... Mr . D.N. Mishra, Standing
Counsel (Railways)

...

CORAM:

•
&

THE HON'BLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.)

• • • •

J U D G M E N T

K.P. ACHARYA, V.C. In both these applications, prayer of the petitioners Shrimati Gandhi Dhobi and another (O.A. No.169 of 1994) and Smt. M.B.Maji and another (O.A.No.170 of 1994) is that to give a direction to the Opposite Parties to give a compassionate appointment to their sons who are petitioner Nos.2 in both the cases.

2. In Original application No. 169 of 1994, husband of the Petitioner was initially appointed as a Gangman under PWI, S.E. Railway, Garden reach and attained temporary status after completion of six months continuous service in the Railways and unfortunately husband of

b

the Petitioner No. 2 died on 13th March, 1981. Hence this application has been filed with the aforesaid prayer.

3. In original application No. 170 of 1994, the husband of the petitioner was initially appointed as a Gangman under the PWI, S.E. Railway and after attaining temporary status in the year 1968, unfortunately died on 10th July, 1982. Hence this application has been filed with the aforesaid prayer.

4. No counter has been filed in both the cases for the best reasons known to the Opposite Parties. Since there is no counter filed in both the cases, we are unable to know as to the indigent circumstances if any relating to the petitioners.

5. After hearing Mr. Ashok Chakraborty learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in both these cases and Mr. D.N. Mishra learned Standing counsel appearing for the Railway Administration in both these cases (which were heard one after the other), we feel inclined to adopt the same view as taken in Original Application Nos. 56/94, 57, 58, 165, 166, 167 and 168 of 1994. Therefore, we would direct the Chief Personnel Officer to cause an enquiry through one of its responsible officers regarding the indigent circumstances under which the petitioners are placed. After receiving^a report, the C.P.O. should pass order according to law and in case the petitioners feel aggrieved, they are at liberty to approach the Bench.

6. Thus, both the applications are accordingly
disposed of. No costs.


MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)
24 JUN 94


24.6.94
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Cuttack Bench/K. Mohanty/June 24, 1994.