

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,¹⁰
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

Sr.No.34

**C.P.NO.050/00074/2015 IN
O.A.060/00535/2014**

SARANJIT KAUR VS. S.K. CHADHA ETC.

08.04.2015

Present: Mr. Barjesh Mittal, counsel for the petitioner.

1. Heard.
2. Argues, inter-alia, that while allowing the Original Application along with a bunch of petitions on consensual basis, vide a common order dated 6.12.2014, the Bench had recorded a clear finding that the case of the applicants would be considered in view of law cited by learned counsel for the applicant i.e. Babli Devi & Another Vs. U.T. Chandigarh etc. as well as decision in the case of U.T. Chandigarh & Another Vs. Sampat & Others in C.A. No. 6779 of 2009 decided by Apex dispensation on 3.4.2014, but, while passing the order rejecting the claim of the applicants on the basis of decision in Bimla Devi Vs. UOI etc. is no consideration in the eyes of law and act, to say the least is contemptuous.
3. Issue notice to the respondents for 11.5.2015.

He
(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

I
(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

HC*

① Orders issued on 10.4.15
AOs executed, bl
② Ws not filed b'
③ BABU RAM

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH CHANDIGARH

24.CP 060/00074/2015 in O.A. No. 060/00535/2014

Saranjit Kaur Vs. S.K. Chadha & Another

11.05.2015

Present: Mr. Barejsh Mittal, proxy counsel for the petitioner

Mr. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents along with

Mr. Naval Kishore, EE PH Divn. No. 3

1. Mr. Naval Kishore, EE PH Divn. No. 3, who is present in Court, submits that the order dated 27.03.2015, rejecting the claim of the petitioner, has inadvertently been passed and, therefore, the same has been withdrawn vide order dated 08.05.2015, which is taken on record. He tenders his unconditional apology for the same, which is accepted.
2. He further submits that in pursuance of the orders of this Court, a fresh order dated 08.05.2015 has been passed granting the relevant benefits to the petitioner herein. The same is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents may be directed to release the actual benefits to the petitioner within a reasonable period. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the same will be disbursed to the petitioner within two months, to which the learned counsel for the petitioner agrees.
4. In view of the above, the CP has become infructuous and is dismissed as such. Notices stand discharged.


(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)

MEMBER (A)

'mw'


(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)

MEMBER (J)