

5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

**O. A. NO. 260/00808 OF 2015**

**Cuttack, this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2016**

CORAM

**HON'BLE MR. R.C. MISRA, MEMBER (A)**

.....

1. Sri Anand Mashi Baral, aged about 61 years, S/o- Patras Barla, Resident of Vill/PO-Kalta, PS-Koida, Dist.-Sundargarh, Odisha.
2. David Barla, aged about 34 years, S/o- Sri Anand Mashi Barla, Vill/PO-Kalta, PS-Koida, Dist.-Sundargarh, Odisha.

.....Applicants

Advocate(s)-Mr. S.D. Tripathy

**VERSUS**

Union of India represented through

1. The General Manager, Steel Authority of India Ltd., Raw Material Division, Barsua Iron Mines, At/PO-Tensa, PIN-770042, Dist-Sundargarh.
2. Manager (P&A), Steel Authority of India Ltd., Raw Material Division, Barsua Iron Mines, At/PO-Tensa, PIN-770042, Dist-Sundargarh, Odisha.

..... Respondents

Advocate(s).....

**ORDER (Oral)**

**R.C. MISRA, MEMBER (A)**

Heard Sri S.D. Tripathy, learned counsel appearing for the applicant. By filing M.A. No.929/15, applicant has prayed that David Barla, son of the applicant in favour of whom relief has been sought may be impleaded as Respondent No.3 in the O.A. However, I am of the opinion that since the applicant in this O.A. is claiming the benefit in favour of his son, instead of arraigning him as applicant No.2 in the O.A. under some misconception applicant has prayed David Barla to be impleaded as Respondent No.3. In view of this, it is directed that David



Barla be impleaded as applicant No.2 in the O.A. and accordingly applicant to amend the same. M.A. No.929/15 thus disposed of. On the oral prayer made, both the applicants are permitted to prosecute this O.A. jointly.

2. It is submitted that applicant No.1 has made a representation to Respondent No.2 praying therein that the benefit of employment on compassionate ground may be granted to his son (applicant No.2) on account of the fact<sup>R</sup> that the employee concerned is being declared medically invalid. In this regard, it is however brought to my notice that respondent No.2 has written a letter dated 21.12.2013 to applicant No.1 intimating that after examination by the Board it was found that the reports were inconclusive and accordingly applicant was required to submit further report in this regard for consideration. It is also submitted that in response to that letter applicant has submitted the necessary documents vide his letter dated 04.01.2014 to Respondent No.2. According to applicant even<sup>h</sup>though all the required documents have been submitted, no decision has been taken regarding compassionate appointment of his son in keeping with the extant rules.

3. Since the matter is apparrantly under consideration before the Respondents authorities and the applicant claims to have submitted the reports as required by the Respondent No.2 in complete form, at this stage without going into the merit of the matter I would direct Respondent No.2 to take into account the reports so submitted and take appropriate decision in accordance with the existing rules governing compassionate appointment in favour of applicant No.2.

*[Signature]*

However, Respondent No.2 is directed to communicate the decision taken thereon to the applicant(s) within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of this order.

4. With the above observation & direction the O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission itself. No costs.

5. On the prayer made by Mr. S.D. Tripathy, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, copy of this order, along with paper books, be sent to Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 by Speed Post at the cost of the applicant for which he undertakes to file the postal requisites by 13.01.2016.

  
**(R.C.MISRA)**  
**MEMBER(A)**

BKS