

12.04.2007

OA No. 527/2005

Mr. Rajesh Jain, Counsel for applicant.  
Mr. T.P. Sharma, Counsel for respondents.

Heard the learned counsel for the parties. The OA is disposed of by a separate order, for the reasons recorded therein.

  
D.P. SHUKLA  
MEMBER (A)

AHQ

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR**

Jaipur, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 527/2005**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. J.P. SHUKLA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

1. Jatan Devi wife of Late Shri Bhanwar Singh aged 54 years, resident of V. & P. Santhali, Tehsil Devli, District Tonk.
2. Dashrath Singh son of Late Shri Bhanwar Singh, aged 20 years, resident of V. & P. Santhali, Tehsil Devli, District Tonk.

By Advocate: Mr. Rajesh Jain

.....Applicants

**Versus**

1. Union of India through Director, Prasar Bharti, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Doordarshan, Mandi House, New Delhi.
3. Doordarshan Maintenance Centre, Government of India, Bhilwara.
4. Assistant Engineer, Doordarshna Relay Centre, Tonk.

By Advocate: Mr. Tej Prakash Sharma

.....Respondents

**ORDER (ORAL)**

Heard the learned counsel for the parties. Learned counsel for the applicants submitted that as per directions given by this Tribunal in OA No. 444/2004 on 01.03.2005, case of the applicant was considered by the Committee and the same has been rejected due to non-availability of the vacancies and the case being more than three

*Signature*

years old, as death of the deceased employee occurred prior to the year 2002. Learned counsel for the applicant argued that son of the deceased employee attained the age of majority in the year 2003 and, hence, he is entitled for consideration for appointment on compassionate grounds upto the year 2006, whereas his case has been rejected in the year 2005.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents argued that in view of the period prescribed for making appointment on compassionate grounds and the circular issued by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Department of Personnel & Training, case of the applicant was considered by the Committee and after due consideration, the same has been rejected due to non-availability of the vacancy and the his case being more than three years old.
3. In the facts & circumstances of the case, this Tribunal does not find any merit in this case. Hence the OA is dismissed with no order as to costs.



(J.P. SHUKLA)  
MEMBER (A)

AHQ