

(2)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW BOMBAY BENCH, NEW BOMBAY

OA. 516/90

Stamp Application No. 439/90

Mrs. Meena Nitin Gurav

... Applicant

vs.

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Member (J), Shri A.P.Bhattacharya
Hon'ble Member (A), Shri M.Y. Priolkar

Appearances:

Shri V.M.Pradhan, Advocate,
for the applicant.

None present for the
respondents.

JUDGEMENT:

Dated: 20 July 1990

(Per. Shri A.P.Bhattacharya, Member (J))

This application under Section 19 of the
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 has been filed by
Mrs. Meena Nitin Gurav against the Union of India, repre-
sented by the Chief General Manager, Telecommunication,
Maharashtra Circle, Bombay, and two others.

2. In this application the applicant has prayed for
quashing the order shown in Annexure-G to the application
and issuing directions on the respondents so that they
may allot her quarters No.D-1/2, P&T Colony, Santa Cruz
East, on adhoc basis.

3. The applicant has been working as a Telegraphist
in Central Telegraph Office, Bombay, since 1983. She was
married with one Shri Nitin Gurav in 1981. Since her
marriage she has been residing at Quarters L-1/2, P&T
Colony, Santa Cruz East, allotted to her father-in-law,
V.B.Gurav, who was an Overseer in the P&T Department.
Since her marriage she has been living in the said quarter
of her father-in-law as a member of the joint Hindu
family. Her father-in-law retired from service on

28.2.90. Her father-in-law made an application to respondent No.3 for transferring the said quarters in the name of the applicant. Ultimately, an order was passed by Annexure-G by which the prayer was rejected.

4. On a consideration of the materials on record we are of the opinion that this application is not at all fit for adjudication by this Tribunal. Under the Rules quarters occupied by ^a government servant can only be allotted on ad-hoc basis to his son, unmarried daughter, wife or husband on his retirement on superannuation. It is unknown to the rules that some quarters occupied by the father-in-law could be allotted to his daughter-in-law. Merely because the applicant has been residing at the quarters allotted to ^{her} the father-in-law since her marriage would be no ground to allot/transfer the same in her name. Such being the position, we are of the opinion that the respondent authorities had done no wrong in rejecting the prayer. As the applicant has failed to establish any prima facie case we are of the opinion that this case is not at all fit for adjudication by this Tribunal and as such we dismiss it summarily.

20-7-80

(M.Y. Priolkar)
Member (A)

20-7-80
A.P. Bhattacharya
Member (J)