

**ORAL**

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD  
BENCH, ALLAHABAD

(This the **18<sup>th</sup> Day of September**, 2018)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bharat Bhushan, Member (Judicial)**

**Original Application No.330/653/2013**  
(U/S 19, Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985)

1. Smt. Pratima Sen w/o Late Sudhir Sen R/o House No.EWS 801 Awas Vikas, Kalyanpur, No.3 Panki Road, P.O. Kalyanpur Kanpur Nagar.
2. Subrato Sen, Son of Late Sudhir Sen, Resident of House No. EWS 801 Awas Vikas, Kalyanpur, No.3 Panki Road, P.O. Kalyanpur Kanpur Nagar.

..... **Applicants**

**By Advocate: Shri Sunil**

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence (South Block), Government of India, New Delhi.
2. Senior General manager, Small Arms Factory, Kalpi Road, Kanpur.
3. Joint General Manager, Small Arms Factory, Kalpi Road, Kanpur.

..... **Respondents**

**By Advocate: Shri Amitabh Kumar Sinha**

**ORDER**

Shri Sunil, Advocate is present for the applicants. Shri Amitabh Kumar Sinha, Advocate is present for the respondents.

2. Heard counsel for the parties.
3. Counsel for the applicants has submitted that matter pertains to compassionate appointment. It is also submitted that during the pendency of this OA, applicant No.2, Subrato Sen, son of application No.1 has been appointed on compassionate ground on 08.01.2015. This fact has been reiterated by learned counsel for the respondents

and Supplementary Counter Reply also confirms this fact. Para- 2 and 3 of the Supplementary Counter Reply filed on 03.05.2018 is reproduced as below:-

*"2. That, during the pendency of the aforesaid OA, the applicant No.2 Subrato Sen S/o late Sudhir Sen has been appointed on compassionate ground on 8.1.2015 vide Small Arms Factory, Kanpur order No.561 dated 10.1.2015 according to marks scored/obtained on merit.*

*A copy of factory order no.561 dated 10.01.2015 and details of appointed candidates on compassionate ground from the year 2012 are enclosed herewith and marked as Annexure SCA-1.*

*3. That, now the grievance of the applicant has already been settled and as such the aforesaid OA has become infructuous."*

4. It is, therefore, evident that grievance of applicants has been settled and, therefore, this OA has become infructuous. Accordingly, the OA is dismissed as having become infructuous. No costs.

**(Justice Bharat Bhushan)**  
Member (J)

Sushil