#### Page 1 of 6

## ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'bleMrs.UrmitaDatta (Sen), Member(J) The Hon'bleMr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

#### Case No - OA-215 of 2016.

| Serial No. and  | Sourav Majumdar. <u>Vs</u> The State of West Bengal & Others.<br>Order of the Tribunal with signature | Office action with date                               |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Date of order.1 | 2   | and dated signature<br>of parties when necessary<br>3 |
| 14              | For the Applicant : Mr.Debabrata Karan,<br>Mr.Debopriyo Karan,<br>Advocates.                          |   |
| 16-04-2019      |   |   |
|                 | For the State<br>Respondent : Mr. S. Bhattacharyya,<br>Departmental Representative                    |   |
|                 | The instant application has been filed  |   |
|                 | praying for direction upon the respondent to  |   |
|                 | provide compassionate appointment of the  |   |
|                 | applicant. As per the applicant, his father died  |   |
|                 | on 28-10-2009 and subsequently his mother   |   |
|                 | applied for compassionate appointment on 01-  |   |
|                 | 01-2010. However his case was rejected by the   |   |
|                 | competent authority vide order dated 04-07-   |   |
|                 | 2012 as per the Labour Department's   |   |
|                 | Notification No. 30-Emp dated 02-04-2008 and  |   |
|                 | G.O. No. 144-Emp dated 14-08-2008. Being  |   |
|                 | aggrieved with, he has filed the instant  |   |
|                 | application.  |   |
|                 | As per the applicant though the case of   |   |

SouravMajumdar

#### Vs.

••••

The State of West Bengal & Others.

| Case No. <u>OA-215 of 2016.</u>       |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Serial No. and<br>Date of order.<br>1 | Order of the Tribunalwith signature<br>2         | Office action with date<br>and dated signature<br>of parties when necessary<br>3 |
|                                       | the applicant was rejected referring 2(two)      |  |
|                                       | G.O.'s of the department. However no detailed    |  |
|                                       | reasoning has been shown in the impugned         |  |
|                                       | order.   |  |
|                                       | The respondents have filed their written         |  |
|                                       | reply wherein they have stated that the case of  |  |
|                                       | the applicant was considered in the light of the |  |
|                                       | G.O. dated 02-04-2008 and 14-08-2008 as the      |  |
|                                       | applicant had filed the prescribed proforma      |  |
|                                       | beyond 6(six) months' time as well as the gross  |  |
|                                       | monthly income of the family was more than       |  |
|                                       | 90%. Moreover the applicant was not solely       |  |
|                                       | dependent upon his father as the mother of the   |  |
|                                       | applicant was also working as Home Guard and     |  |
|                                       | the entire family income has to be considered    |  |
|                                       | and since in his case there total family income  |  |
|                                       | is more than 90% of the income of the deceased   |  |
|                                       | employee. Therefore as per the circular, the     |  |
|                                       | total income of the family has to be considered. |  |
|                                       | Thus after considering the mother's income and   |  |
|                                       | other income, it was found that the applicant is |  |
|                                       | not suffering any financial hardship due to the  |  |
|                                       | death of the father of the applicant. Therefore  |  |
|                                       | the Counsel for the Departmental                 |  |

SouravMajumdar

# Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

| Case No. <u>OA-215 of</u>             |   | Office action with date                     |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Serial No. and<br>Date of order.<br>1 | Order of the Tribunalwith signature<br>2          | and dated signature of parties when necessa |
|                                       | Penresentative has proved for rejection of the    | 3   |
|                                       | Representative has prayed for rejection of the    |   |
|                                       | OA.   |   |
|                                       | The applicant has filed his rejoinder             |   |
|                                       | where he has basically reiterated the             |   |
|                                       | submission made in the OA. However he has         |   |
|                                       | further submitted that as the applicant's         |   |
|                                       | mother is a lady Home Guard, therefore her        |   |
|                                       | salary should not be considered while rejecting   |   |
|                                       | the claim of the applicant.                       |   |
|                                       |   |   |
|                                       | We have heard both the parties and                |   |
|                                       | perused the records. It is noted that the case of |   |
|                                       | the applicant was rejected on the ground being    |   |
|                                       | not found fit as per the G.O. dated 04-07-2012    |   |
|                                       | though in the impugned order no details           |   |
|                                       | ground has been referred while rejecting the      |   |
|                                       | case of the applicant. However as per the         |   |
|                                       | submission as well as reply filed by the          |   |
|                                       | respondent, the case of the applicant was         |   |
|                                       | rejected mainly on 2(two) grounds :-              |   |
|                                       | (1) The applicant had filed the proforma          |   |
|                                       | application beyond 6(six) months' time.           |   |

SouravMajumdar

## Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

| Case No. <u>OA-215 of</u>             | <u>2016.</u>                                     | 8  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Serial No. and<br>Date of order.<br>1 | Order of the Tribunalwith signature<br>2         | Office action with date<br>and dated signature<br>of parties when necessary<br>3 |
|                                       | (2) The gross income of the family is more       |  |
|                                       | than 90%.  |  |
|                                       | With regard to the rejection on the              |  |
|                                       | ground of filing of compassionate appointment    |  |
|                                       | by way of filing proforma application. It is     |  |
|                                       | observed that the applicant's mother had filed   |  |
|                                       | application for compassionate appointment on     |  |
|                                       | 01-01-2010. Therefore rejection on the ground    |  |
|                                       | that the proforma application has been filed for |  |
|                                       | later than the prescribed period is not          |  |
|                                       | entertainable as the said issue has already      |  |
|                                       | attaining finality as was held by this Tribunal  |  |
|                                       | that the plain paper application should be       |  |
|                                       | treated as an application for this purpose.      |  |
|                                       | However with regard to the income of the family  |  |
|                                       | is more than 90%, it is noted that the applicant |  |
|                                       | though claimed that their total family income of |  |
|                                       | less than 90%, but he has not brought on         |  |
|                                       | record any calculation or documents to           |  |
|                                       | substantiate his claim that the total family     |  |
|                                       | income of the applicant is less than 90%. It is  |  |
|                                       | also noted that the mother of the applicant was  |  |
|                                       | working as lady Home Guard. Therefore it is      |  |

SouravMajumdar

## Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

| Case No. <u>OA-215 of</u><br>Serial No. and<br>Date of order.<br>1 | Order of the Tribunalwith signature<br>2                  | Office action with date<br>and dated signature<br>of parties when necessary<br>3 |
|--|---|--|
|  | not acceptable that the applicant was solely              |  |
|  | dependent upon the father only and his                    |  |
|  | financial distress has caused due to the death            |  |
|  | of the sole bread earner. In the case of Umesh            |  |
|  | Kumar Nagpal Vs. the State of Haryana it is               |  |
|  | reported in 1994 (4) SCC 135, it has been held            |  |
|  | by the Apex Court that the main purpose of the            |  |
|  | compassionate appointment is to enable the                |  |
|  | family to overcome the sudden crisis cause due            |  |
|  | to the sudden demise of the sole bread earner.            |  |
|  | In the instant case the applicant's mother was            |  |
|  | also government employee, thus we do not find             |  |
|  | any reason to entertain the instant OA.                   |  |
|  | Accordingly, the OA is dismissed being devoid             |  |
|  | of merit.   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
| Mihir  | P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN)<br>MEMBER(A) MEMBER(J) |  |
|  |   |  |

Case No.OA-215 of 2016.

SouravMajumdar

#### .... Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

| Case No. <u>OA-215 of</u>        | DA-215 of 2016                           |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Serial No. and<br>Date of order. | Order of the Tribunalwith signature<br>2 | Office action with date<br>and dated signature<br>of parties when necessary |
| <b>_</b>                         |  | 3   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |
|                                  |  |   |