

Lib

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

OA No.637/2019

Dated this Tuesday the 24th day of September, 2019

Coram: R. Vijaykumar, Member (A).

Smt. Pratibha Daniel Alhat
Aged 54 years, Occ. Housewife,
Seva Nagar, Opp. Rahda Kunj
Building, 4th Floor, Pestom Sagar,
Chembur, Mumbai-400 089.

...Applicant.

(By Advocate Shri P. Wagh).

Versus

1. Financial Advisor
Chief Accounts Officer,
(F.A.& C.A.O.) Pen,
Central Railway, CST,
Mumbai-400 001.
2. Pension Adalat
Madhya Railway Office
C.S.T. Mumbai (782426).
3. Ms. Rebeka @ Shidu,
Age 45 years, Occ. Service,
Sweeper, C.S.T. Station,
Railway Employees, Central Railway,
C.S.T. Mumbai 400 001.
4. D.R.M., CSTM (Mumbai Division)
Central Railway Office at
Central Railway, CST Station,
Mumbai-400 001.
5. Sr. D.P.O., CSTM
Central Railway Office at
Central Railway, CST Station,
Mumbai-400 001.

... Respondents.

O R D E R (O R A L)
Per : R. Vijaykumar, Member (Administrative)

1. This application has been filed on 18.07.2019 under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

"(a) This Hon'ble court may please to issue direction to the Respondents to provide the retiral benefits and pension of the deceased husband namely, Daniel Eknath alhat, i.e. to the applicant;

And/alternative

This Hon'ble Court may please direct the Respondent No.4 to take re-hearing of the Applicant in order to consider claim of the Applicant to provide retiral benefits, pension of her deceased husband to her.

(b) Pending the hearing and final disposal of the present application, this Hon'ble Court may please to prevent the Respondents from providing the retiral benefits, pension and employment to the Rebeka.

(c) Any other and further reliefs as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper."

2. This is a 3rd round of litigation in which the directions were issued in the last OA No.705/2016 dated 19.10.2016 directing the respondents to pass a reasoned and speaking order and which they have done in their orders dated

11.06.2019. The applicant has now challenged this order.

3. The case was listed today and duly noted by the learned counsel for the applicant but when the matter came up for hearing neither the applicant nor the learned counsel for him were present even on the revised call.

4. In these circumstances, it is apparent that the applicant does not seem to have interest in pursuing this matter any further before this forum.

5. The OA is, therefore, accordingly dismissed in default as well as for non-prosecution by the applicant.

6. There shall be no order as to costs.

(R. Vijaykumar)
Member (A)

v.

JD
24/9/19

