

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A. No.182/2006

Friday this the 22nd day of December, 2006

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR.N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Rajamony Amma
Veena Bhawan
Thottinu Vadakku
Chavara, Kollam District
Kerala State

: **Applicant**

(By Advocate Mr. R.Rajasekharan Pillai)

Versus

1. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research
Krishi Anusandhan Bhawan
PUSA, New Delhi -
Represented by the Secretary

2. The Director
Central Plantation Crops Research Institute
Kasaragod

3. The Joint Director
Central Plantation Crops Research Institute
Kayamkulam

: **Respondents**

(By Advocate Mr. T.P.Sajan)

The application having been heard on 22.12.2006, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :

ORDER

HON'BLE MR.N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

The learned counsel for applicant presents the case of the applicant which is according to him quite pathetic. Her husband, who is no more, was a casual labourer, and before all the due ^{his} ~~fora~~, the question of regularisation was ^{Mr.} ~~dis~~ agitated. In fact, the Industrial Tribunal vide order dated 20.10.1998 ordered the regularisation retrospectively with effect from 21.12.1993 which was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court by virtue of order in



Annexure A-3. Unfortunately, the husband of the applicant died on 06.10.1998, prior to the date of award of the Industrial Tribunal. The counsel's contention is that had he been regularised, then his spouse had a chance of applying for compassionate appointment scheme applicable to the ICAR vide Annexure R-1. In fact two prayers have been made in this application, the first for quashing Annexure A-6 refusing benefits of regularisation to the husband of the applicant, and the second prayer for granting her compassionate appointment on account of the death of her husband. The counsel represents that her representation is pending before the Director General, ICAR who is Respondent No.1, vide Annexure A-8 dated 20.10.2004. This has not been disposed of on one way or other so far. He will be satisfied if a direction is given to the respondents to duly consider and dispose of the same. The learned counsel for respondents has no objection to such a direction. It is seen that this representation was submitted more than two years back. Hence for such a disposal longer time should not be given.

2. Under the circumstances, it is ordered that Respondent No. 1 shall dispose of Annexure A-7 representation within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The Original Application is disposed of as above. No costs.

Dated, the 22nd December, 2006.



N.RAMAKRISHNAN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

vs