

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 488/92

199

T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION 9.7.1992

SMT.K.L.KAMBLE

Petitioner

SHRI V.D.SURVE

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

~~None~~ Naval Dockyard, Bombay

Respondent

None

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble ~~Mr.~~ USHA SAVARA, MEMBER(A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

S.K.Dhaon
(S.K.DHAON)
Vice-Chairman

mbm*

3

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 488/92

SMT.KESARBAI LAXMAN KAMBLE,
Wd/of Laxman Vithal Kamble,
residing at Ramabai Ambedkar Nagar,
behind 107/108, Zopadpatti,
Express Highway Road, Ghatkopar,
Bombay - 400075

....Applicant.

V/s

1. Union of India,
through Asstt. Personnel Manager
for Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dockyard, Bombay 400023
2. Personnel Manager,
for Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dockyard, Bombay - 400023
3. Smt.Chandrabhagabai L.Kamble,
At and Post Ambivali, R.C.Colony,
Taluka Kalyan, Dist.Thane.

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman

HON'BLE MEMBER USHA SAVARA, MEMBER(A)

Appearance :

Mr.V.D.Surve, Adv for the
applicant.

None for the Respondents

ORAL JUDGEMENT

9TH JUL 1992

(PER : S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman)

The applicant alleges that, she is a lawfully wedded wife of one Laxman Vithal Kamble. Kamble died. The applicant claims arrears of pension and gratuity. This claim has not been accepted on the ground that the applicant is not the lawfully wedded wife of Kamble deceased, as her marriage with him was void. This decision is being impugned in the present application.

2. We find that earlier the applicant came to this Tribunal with the similar grievance and on 5th June 1991 this Tribunal held, that the controversy raised by the applicant was not a service matter as the declaration of status was involved. This decision became final ^{in 5} So far as the applicant acquiesced into the same.

3. This application is not maintainable. ^{29/2} This is rejected summarily.

Usha Savara
(USHA SAVARA) 9.7.92
MEMBER(A)

S.K. Dhaon
(S.K.DHAON)
Vice-chairman

srl