

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:354/2001

DATE OF DECISION:30.8.2001

Smt. Hemlata Dhanraj Kamellu Applicant.

Shri J.M. Tanpure Advocate for
Applicant.

Verses

Union of India and others Respondents.

Shri R.K. Shetty Advocate for
Respondents

CORAM

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

NS

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 354/2001

THURSDAY the 30th day of AUGUST 2001

CORAM: Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member(A)

Smt. Hemlata Dhanraj Kamellu
Residing at 25/16, 'J' Type: I
Range Hills, Pune.

...Applicant

By Advocate Shri J.M. Tanpure.

V/s

1. Union of India through
The Commandant,
Ammunition Depot,
Dehu Road, Pune.

2. General Manager,
Ammunition Factory
Khadki, Pune.

...Respondents.

By Advocate Shri R.K. Shetty.

ORDER (ORAL)

{Per Shanta Shastry, Member(A)}

The relief claimed in this OA by the applicant is to grant family pension, gratuity, Provident Fund etc. alongwith 18% interest thereon as well as to take a decision for compassionate appointment within a stipulated period.

2. The applicant's husband late Shri K.S. Dhanraj was working as LDC with respondent No.1. He was suffering from Pulmonary Tuberculosis and was admitted in the Talegaon General Hospital and convalescent Home on 5.6.1998. However he absconded from there on the same day. An F.I.R. was lodged at the Police Station Talegaon at Human Missing Register No. 23/98 on 9.6.1998. Since one year has lapsed after filing of the FIR and applicant's husband has not appeared again, the applicant in this case has

...2...



claimed family pension etc as per rules. During the course of the hearing today, it transpires that the respondents have agreed to consider the case of the applicant for family pension and accordingly the applicant was asked to visit the office in person and was also asked to file indemnity bond. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the indemnity bond was submitted. However the concerned authorities did not accept it on the ground that it is too lengthy. Now the learned counsel for the respondents has agreed to consider the same. The indemnity bond is handed over to the concerned authority in the court today.

3. In view of the fact that the respondents have agreed to consider the case of the applicant for family pension, nothing survive except to direct the respondents to expedite the matter and decide it within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

4. The applicant has also claimed gratuity. The respondents are directed to consider the same alongwith the case of family pension. Further the applicant in this application has also requested to expedite the decision on the application of the applicant dated 18.10.1999 for compassionate appointment. This amounts to multiple relief which is not permissible under the Rules. Therefore the learned counsel for the applicant is not pressing this relief. The OA is disposed of accordingly.

Shanta F

(Smt. Shanta Shastri)
Member(A)