

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 341/2003.

this, the 5th day of September 2003.

HON. SMT. MEERA CHHIBBER MEMBER(J)

Vidya Devi aged about 50 years wife of Shri Gajraj Singh resident of Village Nagala Khuru, Post Office Kanjhana, District-Garukkhabad.

....Applicant.

BY ADVOCATE SHRI S.N. GOSWAMI.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through General Manager  
N.E. Railway, New Delhi.
2. Divisional Manager, N.E. Railway, Lucknow.
3. Office Superintendent DE (Power) NE Railway,  
Gonda.

....Respondents.

BY ADVOCATE SHRI C.B. VERMA.

ORDER (ORAL)

BY HON. SMT. MEERA CHHIBBER MEMBER(J)

By this O.A, the applicant has sought direction to the respondents to make payment of the substantial arrears and sustainable amount of the whole service of Shri Gajraj Singh and to direct the respondent No. 2 to



decide the representation dated 23.8.2002 preferred by the applicant.

2. It is submitted by the applicant that her husband Shri Gajraj Singh was working as Diesel Assistant in North Eastern Railway Gonda, but his whereabouts is not known since 2nd August 1994. She had also lodged the FIR in GRP, Gonda on 9.5.96 to this effect a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure No,2 to this O.A. Thereafter, since till date nothing <sup>his</sup> has come to notice with regard to <sup>2</sup> <sub>2</sub> whereabout, therefore, she gave a representation to the DRM Eastern Railway, Lucknow on 18.9.2001 (Annexure No. 3) ~~forwarded~~ by another representation dated ~~22.7.02~~ 23.8.2002(Page-15 of the O.A.) requesting the authority to give her amounts which are payable as whereabouts of her husband are not known for about morethan 7 years. The grievance of the applicant in this case is, that till date, respondents have neither given any reply to the applicant nor made any payments to her, therefore, she had no~~t~~ other option but to file the present O.A.

3. Counsel for the respondents was not in a position to clarify the position as he wanted <sup>2</sup> time to file reply in the case.

4. I have heard the applicant's counsel and at this stage, I feel that no purpose would be served by calling a counter from the respondents as the applicant's representation has not <sup>yet</sup> <sub>in</sub> been considered by the authority so far. I think it would be the interest of justice to decide the O.A. at the admission stage by giving a direction to respondents to consider the representation



of the applicant by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months under intimation to the applicant.

5. The O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage without any order as to costs.



MEMBER(J)

LUCKNOW: DATED: 5.9.2003.

V.