

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 713/2000

DATE OF DECISION:02/03/2001

Smt. Hajra Bee

Applicant

Shri S.V.Marne

--Advocate for
Applicant.

Versus

Union of India & 3 Ors.

--Respondents.

Shri V.S.Masurkar

--Advocate for
Respondents.

Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastray, Member(A)

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
2. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?
3. Library. ✓

Shanta F
(SHANTA SHAstry)
MEMBER(A)

abp

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:713/2000
DATED THE 2ND DAY OF MAR.2001**

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT.SHANTA SHAstry, MEMBER(A)

Smt.Hajra Bee,
Widow of Late Shri Mohammed Khan
Hassan Khan,
Working as Switchman under the
Station Manager, Itarsi,
Central Railway. **Applicant**

By Advocate Shri S.V.Marne

V/s.

1. Union of India through
The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Headquarters Office,
Mumbai CST, Mumbai - 400 001.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Bhusaval Division,
Bhusaval.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Central Railway, Bhopal Division,
Bhopal.
4. The Station Manager,
Central Railway, Itarsi Station,
Itarsi (M.P.) **Respondents.**

By Advocate Shri V.S.Masurkar

(ORAL) (ORDER)

Per Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member(A).

Shri S.V.Marne for the Applicant and Shri V.S.Masurkar for the Respondents. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that the prayer of the applicant was for issuing of complementary railway passes to her and her son for the years 1998, 1999 and 2000 for different periods. The respondents have now issued her and her son one second class complementary pass IJ-161602 and the same has been handed over on 28/11/2000 for the

:2:

year 2000. Accordingly further issue of complimentary passes will be done according to rules on the subject from Bhusaval Division only.

2. The respondents have explained as to why there has been a delay of three years in issuing the complimentary passes. This has been mainly because of the formation of the new division at Bhopal. The late husband of the applicant was under the control of Bhusaval Division and after the formation of the division in Bhopal, Itarsi where the applicant's husband was working has gone under Bhopal division and therefore the delay has occurred.

3. The Railway Board issued orders on 24/4/98 making the widows of the employees who were in service prior to 10/3/97 entitled to complimentary passes. Accordingly, the applicant had applied for the same. However, she had not been issued these passes,

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has now received a complimentary pass for the year 2000 and in regard to the earlier years, since retrospective passes cannot be issued, the applicant should be compensated for by ordering costs on the respondents.

5. I do find that there has been some delay which has been explained as due to the formation of new division, even then it should not have taken so much time for the respondents to issue the passes.

6. I therefore order costs of Rs.500/- to be paid to the applicant.

6. OA is accordingly disposed of.

Shanta F

(SHANTA SHAstry)
MEMBER(A)