

(71)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A. No. 733/94.

Dt. of Decision : 25.7.94.

Mrs. P. Ammaji

.. Applicant.

Vs

1. Chief of the Naval Staff,
~~Naval Headquarters~~
New Delhi.

2. Flag Officer,
Commanding in Chief,
Eastern Naval Command,
Naval Base, Visakhapatnam.

3. The Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dockyard,
Visakhapatnam.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. S. Kishore

Mr. S. Kishore Addl. GSCC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.V. HARIDASAN : MEMBER (JUDL.)

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHY : MEMBER (ADMN.)

(22)

.. 2 ..

Q.A.No.733/94:-

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

- - -

The applicant is the young widow of late P.Satyanarayana who while working as an unskilled labour (Token No.1904) under the Admiral Superintendent Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam died on 11.8.1990. The widow has no children ^{but} ~~who~~ has to look after the old mother of her late husband. She requested the authorities concerned for employment assistance on compassionate grounds and she was initially engaged as a casual labour ^{on} ~~for~~ nerrick rates but she was discontinued w.e.f. March 1994.

2. The request of the applicant for compassionate appointment was turned down by the respondents on the ground that she has no children to look after on the death of her husband. ^{by} She paid approximately Rs.30,000/- towards DCRG, CGEIS, GPF balance etc. She is also receiving a sum of Rs.435/- per month towards family pension. Not satisfied with the reply of the respondents the applicant ~~again~~ requested for a reconsideration of her case. Vide Naval Dockyard letter dated 24.3.94 it is stated that her application for reconsideration ^{of} ~~to~~ her case has been forwarded to higher authorities and a decision is awaited.

3. The facts in this case are not disputed. The applicant has become a widow at the age of 31 years and has to sustain herself and look after her old mother-in-law. The amounts received by

her on the death of her husband are not such as would ensure a regular maintenance of herself and her mother-in-law. The respondents seem to have ^{been taking} ~~taken~~ ^{these factors into} ~~into~~ consideration in engaging her as a labour on meretric rates of wages. Some kind of such employment assistance may be offered to her, ^{if} ~~and~~ the same is feasible. In any case, as the request of the applicant is under consideration with the competent authority, we dispose of the application with a direction that the case of the applicant may be considered for appointment or commensurate work taking into consideration all the relevant factors. The decision may be communicated ^{to the applicant} ~~within~~ within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order. No order as to costs.

(A.B.GORTHY)
Member (Admn.)

(A.V.HARIDASAN)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: 25th July, 1994

(Dictated in Open Court)

sd

Copy to:

DEPUTY REGISTRAR(J)

1. The Chief of Naval Staff,
Naval Head Quarters,
Sena Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Flag Officer,
Commanding in Chief,
Eastern Naval Command,
Naval Base, Visakhapatnam.
3. The Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dock Yard,
Visakhapatnam.
4. One copy to Mr.S.Kishore, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.V.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC,CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Library, CAT,Hyderabad.
7. One spare copy.

YLKR

Typed by
Checked by

Compared by
Approved by

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN:MEMBER(J)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR:A.B.GORTHY : MEMBER(A)

Dated: 25.7.94

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in
O.A.NO. 733/94
T.A.NO. (W.P.NO.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as Withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

