

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORDERS OF THE BENCH

29.08.2011

OA No. 348/2011

Mr. Shiv Shankar, Proxy counsel for
Mr. Rajendra Arora, Counsel for applicant.

On the request of the proxy counsel appearing on
behalf of the applicant, put up on 14.09.2011.

Anil Kumar
(ANIL KUMAR)
MEMBER (A)

AHQ

30000/-

K. S. Rathore
(Justice K.S. Rathore)
MEMBER (J)

14.9.2011

Mr. Praveen Purshot, Counsel for applicant

Heard. The OA is disposed of by
a separate order.

Anil Kumar
(Anil Kumar)
M (A)

K. S. Rathore
(Justice K.S. Rathore)
M (J)

30000/-

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

Jaipur, the 14th day of September, 2011

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 348/2011

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.S.RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR.ANIL KUMAR, ADMINISITRATIVE MEMBER

Mahesh Kumar Vijay son of Shri Late Prabhu Dayal, Ex-GDS, resident of Footolow (Aandhi), Jaipur (Rajathan).

... Applicant
(By Advocate : Mr. Praveen Purohit)

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Post Master General, Rajasthan Circle, Department of Posts, Government of India, Jaipur.
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Jaipur Postal Department, Government of India, Jaipur.

... Respondents
(By Advocate : -----)

ORDER (ORAL)

The OA is directed against the order dated 20.04.2011 by which the applicant's request for grant of appointment on compassionate appointment was rejected. In an inquiry conducted by the respondents, it was observed that the family had got terminal benefit of Rs.48,000/-, the family has 6 Biswa agricultural land and has own house to live in.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that as per Annexure A/9, one Smt. Dhapu Devi, whose name find mentioned at sr. no. 1, got terminal benefit to the tune of Rs. 1,18,000/- whereas the applicant had got terminal



benefit only Rs.48,000/-. Therefore, the applicant had served a notice of demand for justice to the respondents to consider his case afresh as the benefit of compassionate appointment has been extended in favour of Smt. Dhapu Devi and in comparison to Smt. Dhapu Devi, the applicant's case is better and his family is more indigent.

3. Be that as it may, we deem it proper to direct the respondents to consider the notice of demand for justice dated 01.04.2011 (Annexure A/2) in accordance with the provisions of law and also directed to consider the case of the applicant for appointment on compassionate grounds if his case stand better footing in comparison to Smt. Dhapu Devi. The applicant is at liberty to file substantive OA if any prejudicial order is passed against him.

4. With these observations, the OA is disposed of with no order as to costs.

Anil Kumar
(Anil Kumar)
Member (A)

K.S.Rathore
(Justice K.S.Rathore)
Member (J)

AHQ