

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA-3799/2017

New Delhi, this the 01st day of November, 2017.

Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)

Sh. Naveen Pawar, age-40, Grp-B,
S/o Late Sh. B.S. Pawar,
Ex-Dy. Office Supdt.
R/o A-7/16, Phase-5,
Aya Nagar Extension,
New Delhi-110047.

... Applicant

(through Sh. R.K. Shukla)

Versus

1. Union of Indian
Through the Secretary
Ministry of Finance
Department of REvenu
Central Board of Excise & Custom
Hudco Vishala Building
Bikaji Cama Place, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Commissioner,
Central Excise, Delhi-I,
C.R. Building, New Delhi.
3. The Dy. Commissioner,
Cadre Controlling Authority
Office of the Chief Commissioner
Of Central Excise, (Delhi Zone),
C.R. Building, IP Estate,
New Delhi.
4. The Asstt. Commissioner,
Cadre Controlling Authority
Office of the Chief Commissioner
Of Central Excise
(Delhi Zone)
C.R. Building, IP Estate,
New Delhi

... Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Heard.

2. Inter alia, it is contended that the case of compassionate appointment of the applicant was decided earlier against him. However, subsequent to the Government OMs, the applicant is of the view that his case can be considered by the respondents. Therefore, to this effect, he has made representation to the respondents. It is the prayer of the applicant that respondent no. 2 may be directed to consider and decide his representation in a time bound manner. One cannot fail to observe that this representation has been moved only on 24.10.2017, less than a week from today.

2. However, in view of the fact that it is a matter of compassionate appointment, I deem it appropriate to issue directions even though the representation has been moved only a week back. The nature of the prayer does not necessitate issuance of notice to the respondents at this stage. Respondent no. 2 is directed to consider and decide the representation of the applicant dated 24.10.2017 in the light of rules, regulations and law in this regard within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Such a direction shall be without any prejudice to any contentions of delay, laches or limitation. It may also be added that such a direction does not in any way, reflect my views on the merits of the case.

(Uday Kumar Varma)
Member (A)