

18.04.2007

OA No. 65/2006

Mr. P.N. Jatti, Counsel for applicant.

Mr. Tej Prakash Sharma, Counsel for respondents.

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

J.P. Shukla
(J.P. SHUKLA)
MEMBER (A)

AHQ

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

Jaipur, the 18th day of April, 2007

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 65/2006

CORAM:

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

Pratik Alha son of Shri Mali Ram by caste Alha aged about 20 years, resident of 46, Chatrasal Nagar (Nandpuri), Malviya Nagar, Jaipur.

By Advocate: Mr. P.N. Jatti

.....Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
2. Principal, Chief Post Master General, Rajasthan Circle, Jaipur.
3. The Director Accounts (Postal), Tilak Nagar, Jaipur.

By Advocate: Mr. Tej Prakash Sharma

.....Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Heard the learned counsel for the parties. The applicant is aggrieved by the decision of Circle Relaxation Committee dated 13.09.2005 (Annexure A/1) for rejecting his claim for appointment on compassionate grounds. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the financial condition of the applicant is indigent and, therefore, the decision of the Committee is arbitrary and is not justified. Learned counsel

Om Prakash

further submitted that father & mother of the applicant expired when he and his sister were quite minor and they were brought up by their close relative. Learned counsel argued that the comparison drawn by the Committee with Shri Pahil Sharma do not indicate the fair assessment on its part.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents argued that the condition of Shri Pahil Sharma as per comparative assessment has been found more indigent in comparison to the applicant. Hence the case of the applicant for giving him appointment on compassionate grounds has been rejected.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and perusal of the records, it is observed that the Committee has already made comparative assessment of the financial condition of the applicant and did not find him suitable to give appointment on compassionate grounds and, hence, his case was rejected. There is no merit in the case of the applicant and thus no interference is required to be called for by this Tribunal. Therefore, the OA is dismissed with no order as to costs.


(J.P. SHUKLA)
MEMBER (A)

AHQ