

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
RANCHI CIRCUIT BENCH
OA/051/00150/2019

Date of order : 15.02.2019

C O R A M

Hon'ble Shri Jayesh V. Bhairavia, Member [Judicial]
Hon'ble Shri Dinesh Sharma, Member [Administrative]

Krishna Nand Chaturvedi, aged about 34 years, s/o Late Rajishwar Chaturvedi, resident of Karma Colony, PO-Karma, PS-Jhumritelya, District-Koderma.

Applicant.

.....

By Advocate : Shri M.A. Khan.

Vs.

1. The Union of India through Director General (L&W), Ministry of Labour & Employment, Government of India, Jaisalmer House, Man Singh Road, New Delhi-110011.
2. The Welfare Commissioner, Labour Welfare Organisation, Sharm Bhawan, PO & PS-Doranda, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand).

Respondents.

.....

By Advocate : None.

O R D E R [oral]

Per Jayesh V. Bhairavia , Member [J] : Heard learned counsel for the applicant. We satisfied with the reasons assigned by the respondents in their speaking order dated 13.04.2018 whereby the claim of the applicant has been considered thoroughly and found not recommendable for

appointment on compassionate ground. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the respondents have committed error in holding that the difference between the age of two consanguine brothers, thus, is only 6 months that is surprising, as it is not biologically possible in human species. It is further contended that the respondents have committed by further holding that in the form of nomination for pension of mother of the applicant as Ms. Kumari Sarita has been mentioned as daughter, whereas in another form the details of Ms Kumari Sarita were given as niece (daughter of the brother of the applicant's mother's husband) and was declared wholly dependent on the applicant's mother after her father's death. The applicant has, therefore, been awarded 0 marks as per the provision of the extant rules in this regard, as the points for having none of the unmarried daughter is zero. Moreover, Ms Kumari Sarita is of the age of 24 years and already married. It is further submitted that the said daughter is dependent on the applicant but the said fact has not been considered by the respondents.

2 We have perused the material on record and examined the impugned order. The reason assigned by the respondents in deciding the

claim of the applicant has been found satisfactory. Hence, the OA is fail accordingly dismissed at the admission stage itself.

[Dinesh Sharma]M[A]

[Jayesh V. Bhairavia]M[J]

pkl.