

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 8/92 Textex XV9x

To be referred to the Reporter or not?

Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?

Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

3.

198

		• •
	DATE OF	DECISION 30.10.92
,	•	•
dy .	•	•
• .	Shri Syed Nooruddin	Petitioner
	• 1	Advocate for the Petitioner (s)
	Versus	· ·
ď	, VCISUS	
•	•	
•	Chief Post Master General	Respondent
,	(Maharashtra Circle Bombay≬	and others
	Shri P.M.Pradhan.	Advocate for the Respondent(s)
•	•	
	:	
CORAM	·	
	•	
The Hon'ble Mr.	Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman	
The Hon'ble Mr.	M.Y.Priolkar, Member (A)	
	•	•
	. •	
1. Whether R	Reporters of local papers may be allowed to	see the Judgement 2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 8/92

Shri Syed Nooruddin

... Applicant.

V/s.

Chief Post Master General (Maharashtra Circle Bombay) Bombay

Post Master General Aurangabad Circle Aurangabad.

Senior Superintendent of Post office Aurangabad Division Aurangabad

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A).

Appearance:

Shri P.M.Pradhan, counsel for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT:

Dated: 30.10.92.

The prayer is that the respondents may be directed to give a suitable employment on compassionate ground to one the heirs of one Shri Syed Nooruddin, who admittedly died in hardness.

A reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents. It is stated therein that the Director General (Posts) New Delhi considered the case of the applicant and rejected the same. In the reply a reference is made to a communication dated 11.2.92 of the Chief Postmaster General, Maharashtra Circle. The original file containing the said communication has been produced before us. We have perused the same. The reason given in the communication is that the Director General (Posts) felt that the purpose of providing immediate assistance did not existsts as the employee (Syed Nooruddin) dies 15 years

...2...

back. This in our opinion is not a relevent consideration. Mere delay on the part of the claimant will not be a relevent ground for not considering the tapplication: for giving a suitable appointment on compassionate ground. The decision of the Director General (Post) therefore is not sustainable.

The Director General (Posts) will apply his mind a fresh on the facts stated in the representation made by the applicant and thereafter pass an order on merits and in accordance with law. If he decides to reject the representation he shall give reasons in support of his order and communicate the same to the applicant within four weeks from the date of making the same.

With these directions this application is disposed of finally.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.Y.Priolkar)
Member(A)

(S.K.DHAON) Vice Chairman.

NS/