

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**BENCH AT AURANGABAD****WRIT PETITION NO. 6011 OF 2014**

SHOBHARAM ASARAM KATIYA AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE UNION OF INDIA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Bhokarikar Madhav M.
Advocate for Respondent nos. 1 and 2 : Mr. Navandar
Manish N.

...

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & A.M. BADAR, JJ.

Dated: September 16, 2015

...

PER COURT :-

Heard.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners invited our attention to the pleadings in the Petition, annexures thereto, relevant Rules and the scheme and also the order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal and submits that, the prayer made by the petitioners ought to have been accepted by the Respondents.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Respondents relying upon the averments in the affidavit in reply and the provisions of the scheme and Rules submits that, the prayer of the petitioners for appointment on compassionate ground has been rightly turned down.

4. We have given careful consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned counsel appearing for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and the reasons assigned in the impugned order.

5. In our opinion, the reasons assigned in the communication/order, and more particularly, clauses 6 and 7 are in consonance with the Rules. No case is made out. The Petition stands rejected.

(**A.M. BADAR, J.**)

(**S.S. SHINDE, J.**)

SGA

...