

-2-

ORDER

ORAL ORDER (PER HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.))

None for the applicant. Heard Mr.C.B.Desai, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA should have been disposed of on 21-04-97 itself, for but ~~the submission~~ the submission made by Mrs.K.V.Ramani to adjourn to this case today so as to enable her ~~to~~ senior to argue this case. We ~~believe~~ ^{oblige} her. But Mrs. S.Thirupura Sundari is absent today. In view of the above, the OA is disposed of under section 15(1) of the C.A.T.(Procedure) Rule.

3. The father of the applicant was a Maistry in the Indian Institute of Chemical ^m Technology, Hyderabad. He died on 28-01-1991. His ~~mother~~ ^{wife} applied on 18-11-91 to R-1 to provide employment to her son who is the applicant herein. That request was rejected. Hence she filed OA.136/93 on the file of this Bench which was disposed of by order dated 28-10-93 directing the applicant to make representation to the Director General, CSIR, New Delhi. The Director General, CSIR, New Delhi was also directed to dispose of that representation when received within 6 months from the date of receipt of that representation.

4. The applicant filed representation and that was disposed of vide order No.14(17)92-E.II. dated 23-5-94 (Annexure-3). The Director General has also rejected her representation up-holding the decision already taken by the Director, CSIR, Hyderabad.

5. This OA is filed for setting aside the impugned order No.14(17)92-E.II. dated 23-5-94 (Annexure-3) ^{and for} with a direction to appoint the applicant to Last Grade Service with all consequential benefits.

-3-


6. A reply has been filed in this OA. The impugned order is very cryptic. It does not explain the reasons for rejecting -- for compassionate ground appointment. The Rule quoted is only a guideline. It is to be noted that that rule is applicable in the present case. Hence, we feel that the case is to be remanded back to R-2 for re-consideration and to issue a speaking order.

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case referred to above, the case is remitted back to R-2 to issue a speaking order in this connection keeping in mind our observation as above.

8. The OA is ordered accordingly. No costs.



(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
MEMBER(JUDL.)



(R. RANGARAJAN)
MEMBER(ADMN.)

Dated : The 28th April 1997.
(Dictated in the Open Court)

spr

Andri
8-597
D-R (J)

..4..

Copy to:

1. The Director, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Hyderabad.
2. The Director General, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Rafi Marg, New Delhi.
3. One copy to Mrs. S. Thirupura Sundari, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. C. B. Desai, SC for CSIR, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to D.R(A), CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One duplicate copy.

YLKR

28/4/97
TYPED BY
COMPILED BY

(6)
CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.R. NGARJAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR:
M(J)

DATED: 28/4/97

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

R.A/C.P/M.A.No.

in

D.A.No. 900/94

ADMITTED INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED
ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLKR

II COURT

