

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

**O.A No. 060/00221/2014**

**Date of decision- 13.03.2014**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)  
HON'BLE MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, MEMBER (A)**

1. Tripta Devi W/o Late Bhumi Dev, R/o 2431-A, Sector 20-C, Chandigarh.
2. Munish Kumar S/o Late Bhumi Dev, R/o 2431-A, Sector 20-C, Chandigarh.
3. Rajnish Kumar S/o Late Bhumi Dev, R/o 2431-A, Sector 20-C, Chandigarh.

**...APPLICANTS**

**BY ADVOCATE:** Sh. Amit Chopra.

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through the Secretary Government of India, Department of Pension and Pensioner's Welfare, New Delhi.
2. The Chandigarh Administration, Union Territory Chandigarh through its Secretary Engineer and Chief Engineer, Chandigarh Administration, Sector-9, Chandigarh.
3. Sub Divisional Engineer, M.C.P.H.Sub Divn. No. 1, Chandigarh.
4. The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Union Territory, Chandigarh.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**BY ADVOCATE:** Sh. Rakesh Verma

**ORDER (ORAL)****HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-**

By means of the present Original Application, the applicants have sought, inter alia, issuance of direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the applicant no. 2 for compassionate appointment.

2. In support thereof, learned counsel for the applicants submitted that immediately after the death of the deceased employee, the applicant no. 2 approached the respondent department and made representation for the grant of appointment on compassionate grounds. Vide memo dated 01.03.2013, he was lastly informed by respondent no. 3 that his case for compassionate appointment is under consideration. But till date, they have not decided the case of the applicant no. 2.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant made a statement at the bar that the applicants would be satisfied if a direction is given to respondent no. 2 to decide the pending representation of the applicant no. 2 in a time bound manner.

4. There is no need to issue notice to the respondents. However, Sh. Rakesh Verma, Advocate, who is having advance notice, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondents. He could not raise any objection to the prayer made by the counsel opposite to decide

A handwritten signature consisting of a vertical line and a curved flourish at the bottom.

the pending representation of the applicant no. 2. He, however, prays that the authorities may be granted two months time to decide the issue.

5. Considering the fact that the matter is till pending with the respondent's department, therefore, without going into the merits of the case, the present O.A is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority amongst the respondents to take a final view on the pending representation as made by applicant no. 2, by passing a speaking order, supported with reasons as per law and rules within a period of two weeks' from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Orders so passed be duly communicated to the applicants.

6. With the observations and directions as above, this O.A. stands disposed of with no orders as to costs.

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**Dated: 13.03.2014.**

'jk'