

(A)

CAT / J / II

## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

O.A./T.A./R.A.No. 550 ..... 199 6.

Smt. U. Baivamma ..... Applicant (s)

Versus  
Union of India & or ..... Respondent (s)

Sr. No

Date

Order with Signature

REGISTER

Registrar

1. 2-8-96

Shri B.P. Yadav, learned Counsel

for the applicant is heard. In this application the applicant prays for a direction to the respondents to pay ex-gratia allowances to her with effect from 1-1-1986. He next prays for a compassionate appointment to one of the family members. The applicant's husband, late Kistamma was appointed under the P.W.I., S.E. Railway, Sompata, Kanchili Post -Srikakulam as a Gangman on 24-3-1968 and he continuously worked in service upto 7-6-1974 when he died in harness. He was allotted the Provident Fund Account No. 488910.

Plea for compassionate appointment of a member of the family can not be admitted at this point of time two decades after the death of late Kistamma. The counsel has brought to my notice the liberalised scheme of ex-gratia payment to the widow and dependent

1. P.O. for Rs 50/-  
has been filed.

B

30/7/96.

Per Regn pl.

B

30/7/96

Chen

30.07.96

Regist

Per Admn. &  
I.O. pl.

B

1-8-96.

Bench

22

O.A. 550/96.  
(A)

Serial No of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature
		<p>children of deceased Government employees governed under the CPF Scheme. He has brought to my notice Government of India instructions vide No.4.1.187 dated 13-6-1988. There is no doubt that this application with regard to compassionate appointment can not be entertained at this stage. There is also no doubt that with regard to other claim, the delay is unconscionably long. But benefits granted under instructions quoted above, have to be respected by the authorities when such claims are brought before them. The learned counsel draws my attention to Annexure- A/4 page 8 of the petition, in which the applicant had furnished a prescribed form to the Senior Divisional Personnel Officer relying on the aforementioned circular who is impleaded as Respondent No.3 in this petition. It is averred that this claim of the applicant has not been disposed of. While disposing of this application, it would be appropriate to give a direction to Respondent No.3 to dispose of the said representation of the applicant made to the Respondent No.3 in accordance with the provisions of law within a time frame of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Original Application is disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> <i>Harasimber Singh</i> 2/8/96  <b>MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)</b> </p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;"> <i>Or. no. 1 may be kept</i>  <i>Copy of order dt 2.8.96</i>  <i>may be given to the</i>  <i>counsel for both side.</i>  <i>Alm</i>  <i>2.8.96</i>  <i>2/8/96</i>  <i>counsel for per</i> </p>