

Free copy
of the order
of 21.11.2000
given to the
both Counsel.

24/11/2000
Smti
Smti
Smti

Order dated 21.11.2000

In this Application petitioner, who is widow of one Bhagabat Panda has prayed for compassionate appointment to her 3rd son Sri Prakash Chandra Pand. Respondents have filed their counter opposing the prayer of the applicant.

We have heard Shri D.P.Dhalasamant, the learned counsel for the applicant and Shri J.K.Nayak, the learned Addl. Standing Counsel appearing for the Respondents. Also perused the records.

For the purpose of considering this petition it is not necessary to go into too many facts of this case. The admitted position is that husband of the applicant Shri Bhagabat Panda was working as E.D.B.P.M., Purunagarh B.O. in account with Fulusinga S.O. and he passed away during harness on 2.2.1999. Applicant's prayer for giving compassionate appointment to her 3rd son was not accepted by the departmental authorities, that is why being aggrieved she has come up in this O.A. with the prayers referred to above.

Respondents in their counter have stated and the applicant has not denied this by filing any rejoinder that the deceased E.D. employee left behind four sons, two daughters, the widow and old mother. The daughters were marred during the life time of the E.D. employee. Of the four sons three sons are employed and are getting salaries of Rs.6501/- Rs.5000/- and Rs.4000/- respectively. It is also stated by the Respondents that the family has got 15 acres of agricultural land. After the death of the ~~applicant~~ applicant's husband, the widow has been granted Rs.18,000/- towards exgratia gratuity and Rs.30,000/- towards severance allowance. Besides an amount of Rs.10, 692/- is due to be paid to the applicant. In consideration of the above, specially in consideration of the fact that three sons of the applicant are in Govt. service, we find no illegality has been committed by the Circle Relaxation Committee in rejecting the prayer of the ~~applicant~~ applicant for giving compassionate appointment to her 3rd son. In view of this we hold that the O.A. is without any merit and the same is therefore, rejected, but without any order as to costs.

VICE-CHAIRMAN
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)