

9

20

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.532 OF 2006
DECIDED ON 30th OF ~~SEPTEMBER~~, 2007
OCTOBER,

Sri Uma Kanta SethiApplicant

VERSUS

Union of India & OthersRespondents

FOR INSTRUCTIONS

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


N.D.RAGHAVAN
VICE-CHAIRMAN

10

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.532 OF 2006
DECIDED ON 30th OF ~~SEPTEMBER~~, 2007
OCTOBER,

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI N.D.RAGHAVAN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

IN THE CASE OF:

Sri Uma Kanta Sethi, Aged about 20 years, S/O. Brundaban Sethi,
P.O.Surala, Dist-Ganjam.

.....Applicant

Advocates for the Applicant

.....Mr.Prasanna Pattnaik
Mrs.P.Nayak.

Versus:

1. Union of India represented by the Commissioner-Cum-Secretary,
Deptt. of Industries, Central Secretariat, New-Delhi.
2. The Salt Commissioner, O/o."Lavan Bhawan", 2-A, Lavan Marg,
Jhalana Doongari, JAIPUR-302004, Rajasthan.
3. Asst.Salt Commissioner, 8. Lindsay St/1, Council House Street,
Ground Floor(Room No.113), Kolkata-700001.
4. The Supdt. Of Salt, Huma, Dist-Ganjam, Orissa.
5. Factory Officer, Surala Salt Factory, Surala, Ganjam, Orissa.

.....Respondents

Advocate for the Respondents

.....Mr.P.R.J.Dash.



ORDER
SHRI N.D.RAGHAVAN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

I have heard Mrs.P.Nayak, the learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.P.R.J.Dash, the learned Additional Standing Counsel for the Respondents. *None of either. Podding STRA...*

2. In this Original Application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has prayed for the following relief:

“8. RELIEF(S) SOUGHT FOR:

In view of the aforesaid facts the applicant prays that the Hon'ble tribunal may be pleased to grant the following relief(s):

(a) To direct the Respondents to implement the policy decision of the Govt. under compassionate ground, observing the applicant in any job even on daily wages to maintain the livelihood of the family and look after the treatment expenditure of his ailing father.

(b) To grant any other relief(s) as deem fit under the facts and circumstances of the case along with cost of the applicant in the interest of justice.”


3. Since the facts are very simple, it is not necessary to refer to the detailed averments contained in the O.A., counter and rejoinder. Admittedly, the applicant's father, while working as Sepoy, Surala Salt Factory, took voluntary retirement w.e.f. 22.12.2003 on being medically invalidated. It is also admitted that the compassionate appointment case of the applicant has received the attention of the Respondents, but the same has been kept on account of the ban imposed by the Ministry on direct recruitment (Annexure A/8 dated 16.5.2005).



4. What the applicant has prayed in this O.A. is to direct the Respondents to implement the policy decision of the Government for compassionate appointment and to absorb him in any job even on daily wages to maintain the livelihood of the family and look after the treatment expenditure of his ailing father. In the counter, the Respondent-Department have averred on the right of the applicant to compassionate appointment and have prayed for dismissal of the O.A. being devoid of merit.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I hope and trust that the Respondent-Department, being an ideal employer, will consider the grievance of the applicant and give him some engagement on daily wage basis to maintain his livelihood, provided the work is available, till his case for compassionate appointment is considered after revocation of the ban order.

6. With the above observation, the O.A. is disposed of. No costs.


(N.D. RAGHAVAN)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

PPS

fix for pronouncement

on 03.10.07 at

P.M.

