

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
LUCKNOW BENCH
LUCKNOW**

Original Application No. 332/00285/2019

This the 26th day of July, 2019

Hon'ble Ms. Jasmine Ahmed, Member - I

Ruby Bano aged about 44 years D/o late Noorul Hasan R/o 427/25 Tikri
Julahan Sahadatganj District Lucknow.

..... Applicant

By Advocate: Sri Ganesh Gupta.

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Personal, Public
Grievance and Pension, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

2. Director, Central Bureau of Investigation, Head Office, Plot No. 5B, CGO
Complex Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

3. Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, Nawal
Kishore Road, Hazratganj, Lucknow.

..... Respondents

By Advocate: Sri Rajesh Katiyar

ORDER (ORAL)

Delivered by:

Hon'ble Ms. Jasmine Ahmed, Member - I

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant herein is divorcee daughter of the deceased employee. He contended that the divorce of the applicant took place way back in 2005 and the father of the applicant expired on 07.02.2016 meaning thereby at the time of death of the deceased employee, the applicant was solely dependent on the deceased employee. It has also been informed by the counsel for the applicant that the second wife (step mother of the applicant) is getting family pension. The applicant being divorcee daughter from the life time of the deceased employee, the applicant is also entitled for family pension for sustenance.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents states that after the divorce which took place on 09.08.2005, the deceased employee lived for more than ten years irrespective of that he has not mentioned anything in the form making the applicant co-pensioner.

3. Counsel for the applicant states that as the applicant is suffering from hardship she has given representation dated 19.03.2018 to the respondents for taking decision on grant of family pension to her also. He further states that at this stage he will be happy and satisfied if a direction be given by this Tribunal to decide the pending representation of the applicant dated 19.03.2018 in a time bound manner.

4. Taking into consideration the prayer of the applicant, I feel it unnecessary to keep this O.A pending. Accordingly, respondents are directed to decide the pending representation of the applicant dated 19.03.2018 by passing a detailed and reasoned order under intimation to the applicant within two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that nothing has been commented on the merit of the case.

5. With the above observation and direction, the O.A stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Jasmine Ahmed)
Member (J)

RK

