

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**CP No. 155/2019
In
OA No. 149/2017 with
M.A No. 150/2017**

This the 5th day of August, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Kapil Dev Saini aged 26 years
Son of late Shri Shiv Kumar
(Ex-Wiremen ND North Zone-II, CPWD)
R/o H. No. 582/6, Ambedkar Nagar,
Haidarpur, DELHI – 110 088.Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mr. H. P. Chakravorty)

VERSUS

1. Mr. Prabhakar Singh,
Director General,
CPWD, Nirman Bhawan,
NEW DELHI 110001
2. Mr. Vimal Kumar,
Chief Engineer ND North Zone – II,
CPWD, Vidyut Bhawan, Shanker Market,
NEW DELHI 110001.Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. Hanu Bhaskar)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:

The applicant filed OA No. 149/2017 complaining that her case for appointment on compassionate grounds was

not considered. The OA was disposed of on 04.10.2018 directing the respondents to place the case of the applicant before the next meeting of the Compassionate Appointment Committee, without insisting on further documents. This C.P is filed alleging that the respondents did not comply with the orders passed in the OA.

2. Respondents filed compliance report. It is stated that the case of the applicant was considered against the vacancies referable to the half yearly spells of 2017, 2018 and in the year 2019 upto 18.02.2019. It is stated in the course of evaluation, the applicant scored 43 points whereas the candidate by name Sh. Neeraj Kumar Meena secured 73 points and that his case was recommended.

3. We heard Mr. H. P. Chakravorty, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Hanu Bhaskar, learned counsel for respondents.

4. Direction given in the O.A was to place the case of the applicant before the next meeting of the Committee. It is not the case of the applicant that her case was not placed before the Committee. It was clearly stated in the counter affidavit that the applicant secured 43 points whereas the candidate who secured 73 points was recommended for

compassionate appointment. Therefore, it cannot be said that there was any violation on the part of the respondents.

5. We, therefore, close the Contempt Petition. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/Mbt/