

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

OA NO. 2433/2003

This the 3rd day of October, 2003

HON'BLE SH. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

1. Smt. Braham Kaur  
Wd/o late Sh. Karan Singh  
(Constable No.1257/SW)  
R/o Village & P.O. Bhadani  
Distt. Jhajjar, Haryana.
2. Sh. Sombir Singh  
s/o late Sh. Karan Singh  
(Constable No.1257/SW)  
R/o Village & P.O. Bhadani  
Distt. Jhajjar, Haryana.  
(By Advocate: Sh. S.D.Kinra)

Versus

The Commissioner of Police,  
Government of NCT of Delhi  
Police Headquarters,  
I.P.Estate,  
New Delhi-110002.

O R D E R (ORAL)

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the AT Act for issuing direction to the respondents to give appointment to the son of the applicant, i.e., applicant No.2 on compassionate grounds.

2. Facts in brief are that the predecessor in interest of the applicants, namely, Sh. Karan Singh is stated to have expired in harness on 6.12.1993. Applicant made an application to the department for appointment on compassionate grounds. Her request was rejected on 3.11.2000. However, the applicant thereafter again made a request for reconsideration. The same was replied vide order dated 3.3.2003 which states that since the case had already been considered and the decision had already been conveyed to the applicant vide order dated 3.11.2000 that still hold good which shows that the representation which has been rejected vide letter dated

*km*

3.3.2003 is nothing but a repetition of the order dated 3.11.2000 and it is a well-settled law that repeated representations do not extend the limitation period.

3. However, besides that I may mention that applicant had expired some time in December 1993. Application was made by the applicant for appointment of her son on 14.2.94 which was rejected vide impugned order dated 3.11.2000. Perusal of letter dated 3.11.2000 also shows that the applicant's case has been reconsidered and has been again rejected. It appears that earlier also case of the applicant had been rejected but the applicant approached the Court only on 30.9.2003 which is much beyond limitation from the date of impugned order Annexure P-1 (2) and letter dated 3.3.2003 is nothing but a repetition of the earlier order that does not extend the limitation time. Besides that the scheme on compassionate appointment read with various judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court shows that the dependent of the deceased person has no right for appointment. However, scheme has been formulated only with a view, if family of the deceased Govt. employee falls in penury and condition of the family is so destitute, when their immediate financial crisis is to be tied up and in that event the applicant has to be provided a job on compassionate grounds.

4. In this case the deceased has expired in December 1993 and OA has been filed on September 2003 which shows a lapse of about 10 years. The immediate financial crisis, if any, that also does not stand any more. OA has no merits and the same is dismissed. No costs.

  
( KULDIP SINGH )  
Member (J)

'sd'