

Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi

O.A. No.2608/2019

Monday, this the 2nd day of September 2019

Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)

1. Sh. Vipin, Aged about 24 years,
S/o late Sh. Vijay Kumar,
Group – D (Safai Karamchari)
 2. Smt. Sunita, Aged about 41 years,
W/o late Sh. Vijay Kumar,
Group –D (Safai Kareamchari)
Both R/o House No. WZ-1501,
Ground Floor, Tulsi Ram Bagichi,
Nangal Raya, New Delhi-110046
- Applicants

(By Advocate: Mr. GS Sharma)

Versus

1. Director General,
Ministry of Rural Development,
Govt. of India,
Krishi Bhawan,
Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road,
Gate No.6, First Floor, Room No.199,
New Delhi-110001
 2. Under Secretary,
Ministry of Rural Development
State Emporia Building, C-21,
Baba Kharag Singh Marg,
Connaught Place, New Delhi
 3. AD & HOD,
The Council for Advancement of
People's Action and Rural Technology,
Through its Secretary/Chairman,
(Under the aegis of Ministry of Rural Development)
Govt. of India, India Habitat Centre,
Zone, 5A, (Core-C), 2nd Floor,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi
- Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury:

This Original Application (OA) has been filed by the applicant seeking the following reliefs:-

- “i) to direct the respondents to appoint the applicant no.1 on compassionate ground in place of his father, namely, Late Sh. Vijay Kumar;
- ii) to direct the respondents to release the retiral benefits of Late Sh. Vijay Kumar to the applicant no.2;
- iii) To award the cost of the OA;
- iv) to pass such other and further orders which his lordship of this Hon’ble Tribunal deem fit and proper in the existing facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. When the counsel for the applicant was asked about the application given by the applicant for compassionate appointment and the orders passed by the respondents thereon, he could not produce any such application and as such, under Section 20 of the AT Act, 1985, the applicant can only approach the Tribunal after first having exhausted all his remedies which he has not done in the present matter. Later, after pointing out the above position to him, he sought permission to withdraw OA. The said liberty is granted.

3. In view of the limited prayer made by the applicant, the OA is dismissed as withdrawn with the liberty as prayed for.

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/