

13

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH AT
HYDERABAD.

D.A.NO.1084 of 1994.

Between

Dated: 21.6.1995.

N. Lakshmann

...

Applicant

And

1. The General Manager, South Central Railway, Railnilayam, Lallaguda, Secunderabad.
2. The Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, South Central Railway, Railnilayam, Lallaguda, Secunderabad.

...

Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Sri. T. Lakshminarayana

Counsel for the Respondents : Sri. J. Siddaiah, Sc for Rlys.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. A.B.Gorthi, Administrative Member

Contd on 2/-

Copy to:-

1. The General Manager, South Central Railway, Railway Nilayam, Lallaguda, Secunderabad.
2. The Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam, Lallaguda, Secunderabad.
3. One copy to Sri. T.Lakshminarayana advocate, H.No.2-2-185/54/1/D, Bagh Amberpet, Hyderabad-13.
4. One copy to Sri. J.Siddaiah, SG for RIys, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

O.A.1084/94.

Dt. of Decision : 21-06-95.

ORDER

1. As per Hon'ble Shri A.B. Gorthi, Member (Admn.)

The applicant is the widow of Late Shri Padda Ramulu and her claim in this OA is for a direction to the respondents to appoint her on compassionate ground in any Class-IV post.

2. It is stated in the OA that the applicant's husband died on 01-04-1992 while he was in service. This fact is denied by the respondents according to whom the applicant's husband was removed from service on 24-04-1980 for continuous unauthorised absence. The respondents thus contend that as per extant rules the applicant is not entitled to be considered for appointment on compassionate ground.

3. There is no dispute that the next of kin of a dismissed/- on compassionate ground to be considered for appointment on compassionate grounds, even after the death of such employee.

4. It was alleged in the OA that the respondents did not pay the applicant her dues on account of family pension, GPF etc. In this regard it is stated by the respondents that certain amount is due to the applicant on account of the employee's ^{own} Provident Fund, Group contribution and that the said amount would be paid to her on her submission of an affidavit that she is the only legal heir to the employee. Learned counsel for the applicant prayed that a direction be given to the respondents to pay the amount due to her soon after receipt of the affidavit.

5. In the light of what is stated above the OA is liable to be dismissed and it is dismissed at the admission stage itself. It is expected that the respondents would take prompt action to pay the applicant the PF amount due to her ^{immediately or} as soon as the receipt of the required affidavit from her. No costs.

.....
(A.B. Gorthi)
Member (Admn.)

Dated : The 21st June 1995.
Dictated in open Court.

.....
Dy. Registrar (S)

TYPED BY
CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.V.HARIOSAN: MEMBER (C)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI: MEMBER (C)

DATED

21/6/95

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A.NO/R.P.NO/C.P.NO.

in

D.A.NO.

1084/lay

Admitted and Interim directions issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

YLKR

