

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 6648 OF 2015

(Smt. Shashikala wd/o Prabhakar Rao Naik vs. Union of India and others)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders Court's or Judge's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI AND
KUM. INDIRA JAIN, JJ.

DATED : JUNE 16, 2016

Heard Adv. Bambal for petitioner and
Adv. Suekhani holding for Adv. R.G. Agrawal for
respondents.

Perused judgment delivered by Central
Administrative Tribunal. Central Administrative
Tribunal in paragraphs 17 and 18 has found that as
per policy decision dated 12/7/1989 relied upon by
the petitioner, there was no regularisation of casual
labourers , but their engagement only was accepted.

Before this Court, petitioner widow has
raised specific ground vide paragraph 17(III) that as
per list of employees supplied to her, employees
regularised were junior and had completed less
number of working days than her husband. This
ground has not been specifically denied by the
respondents.

Adv. Bambal fairly submits that such list

was not produced for perusal of Central Administrative Tribunal.

If this is correct and employees junior to deceased husband of petitioner were regularised, interpretation of Central Administrative Tribunal on policy decision may not be correct.

Considering the fact that widow of deceased employee is fighting for pension and other terminal benefits, we find it appropriate to grant her liberty to file necessary application with all relevant documents seeking review of the judgment.

Hence, with liberty to file appropriate application before Central Administrative Tribunal, we dispose of the writ petition. Needless to mention that all rival contentions are kept open.

JUDGE

JUDGE

khj