

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.345/2013

Date of Decision: 17.01.2019

**CORAM: RAVINDER KAUR, MEMBER (J)**

Smt. Sushila Mohan Chavan  
 R/at C/o Mr. Umaji Rajput,  
 B-17, Patil Putra, BARC Colony  
 Trombay, Mumbai 400 094. .... **Applicant**  
 (Advocate Shri Vicky Nagrani )

**VERSUS**

1. The Union of India,  
     Through the General Manager,  
     Central Railway H.Q. Office,  
     C.S.T. Mumbai 400 001.
  
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
     Central Railway, having office  
     at 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, C.S.T.M. Mumbai 001.
  
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
     (Personal) C.S.T.,  
     Mumbai 400 001. .... **Respondents**
  
4. Smt. Sitabai W/do Thavru Chavan,  
     Aged about 77 years, .... **Proposed Respondent**  
     No.4.
  
5. Master Kritik Mohan Chavan,  
     Aged about 13 years (Minor)  
     (through his Guardian Grand  
     mother both r/at Sai Baba  
     Mitra Mandal, Azad Nagar Mitaghara  
     Road, Mulund (E),  
     Mumbai 400 081. .... **Proposed Respondent**  
     No.5.

(By Advocate Shri V.D. Vadhavkar - R1 to R3  
 Shri A.R.K. Reddy - R4 & R5)

O R D E R

Vide present OA, the applicant has sought the following reliefs:-

"8.a This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to call for the records of the case from the respondents and after examining the same, quash and set aside the impugned orders dated 25.02.2012.

8.b This Hon'ble Tribunal may further be pleased to direct the respondents to grant compassionate appointment to the applicant.

8.c Cost of the application be provided for.

8.d Any other and further order as this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit in the nature and circumstances of the case be passed."

2. The applicant has challenged the impugned order dated 27.02.2012 (wrongly mentioned as 25.02.2012 in the prayer clause) whereby her request for appointment on compassionate grounds was rejected.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant does not want to press the present OA, however, she wants an assurance that the respondents consider her son for appointment on compassionate grounds as assured by them vide impugned order dated 27.02.2012.

4. The applicant is present in Court and she has submitted that she may be allowed to withdraw the present OA. However, she has made

the similar request as referred above that the respondents be directed to consider the case of her son namely Master Kritik Mohan Chavan for appointment on compassionate grounds on his attaining the age of majority

**5.** In the facts and circumstances of the case, the present OA is dismissed as withdrawn. However, the respondents are directed that in case Kritik, born out of the wedlock between the deceased employee namely Shri Mohan Chavan and the present applicant, applies for appointment on compassionate grounds after attaining majority, his case may be considered as per relevant law and Rules. No order as to costs.

**(Ravinder Kaur)**  
**Member (J)**

ma.

J  
✓  
112

