

11

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

---

**ORDERS OF THE BENCH**

---


**Date of Order: 01.11.2011**

O.A. No.501/2010 with MA No. 318/2010

Ms. Kavita Bhati, counsel for applicant.

Mr. Neeraj Batra, counsel for respondents.

Heard. The O.A. & M.A. are disposed of by a separate order on the separate sheets for the reasons recorded therein.

  
(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)  
MEMBER (J)

Kumawat

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 501/2010**  
**With**  
**Misc. Application No. 318/2010**

DATE OF ORDER: 01.11.2011

**CORAM**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Ishwar Varma S/o late Shri Lal Chand Varma, aged about 28 years, R/o 24, Balanand Ji Ka Rasta, Behind Shahpura House, Chandpole Bazar, Jaipur.

...Applicant

Ms. Kavita Bhati, counsel for applicant.

VERSUS

1. The Chief General Manager Telecommunication, BSNL, Rajasthan Telecom Circle, Sardar Patel Marg, Jaipur.

...Respondent

Mr. Neeraj Batra, counsel for respondent.

**ORDER (ORAL)**

The present Original Application is directed against the impugned order dated 02.04.2008 (Annex. A/1) by which the application submitted by the applicant for appointment on compassionate ground has been rejected.


2. The applicant has served a Notice for Demand of Justice dated 10.04.2010 (Annex. A/5) upon the respondents through his counsel. Upon perusal of the pleadings as well as documents, it is evident that the said notice for demand of justice dated 10.04.2010 (Annex. A/5) is still pending consideration with the respondents, which is not disputed.



3. In view of the above, I deem it just and proper that the ends of justice would be met if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the said notice for demand of justice dated 10.04.2010 (Annex. A/5) and pass a reasoned and speaking order.

4. Consequently, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the said notice for demand of justice dated 10.04.2010 (Annex. A/5) and pass a reasoned and speaking order. If any prejudicial order against the interest of the applicant is passed by the respondents, the applicant will be at liberty to challenge the same by filing the substantive Original Application.

5. With these observations and directions, the Original Application is disposed of. In view of the order passed in the O.A., the M.A. for condonation of delay is also disposed of without entering into the merit of the same. There shall be no order as to costs.

  
(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)  
MEMBER (J)

kumawat