

\$~27.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 4859/2017 & CM APPL. 21024-21025/2017**

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Petitioner

Through: **Mr. J.K. Singh, Standing Counsel for
Railways**

versus

BHAGWAN DEEN AND ANR

..... Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE DEEPA SHARMA

ORDER

29.05.2017

%

The petitioner has assailed the order dated 12.08.2016 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (the Tribunal) in O.A. No. 4320/2014. The tribunal has disposed of the said O.A. The only finding returned by the tribunal is that the application made by the respondents for appointment of their wards under the LARGESS Scheme (the Scheme) were not belated and, therefore, could not be rejected on that ground. The tribunal has, therefore, directed the petitioner to consider the cases of the respondents under the Scheme for the second cycle of 2014 in accordance with the rules within 60 days of the order.

The respondents are due to retire in the year 2017. They applied under the said Scheme for appointment of their sons in their place. The respondent had made the application under the said Scheme on 25.02.2012 through proper channel. However, the same were not processed by the

petitioner along with other candidates of 2012.

By moving an application under the RTI Act, the respondents learnt that their cases have been forwarded to the concerned authorities on 04.04.2014 to be considered for second cycle of 2013 batch. The tribunal relied on Annexure A3 filed with the O.A., which was a letter written by the office of DRM, New Delhi on 04.04.2014 in respect of five applications under the aforesaid Scheme, wherein the cases of the respondents are mentioned at sl. no. 2 and 3. Consequently, the tribunal held that it could not be said that the applications of the respondents were made belatedly.

It is in this background that the tribunal returned a finding that there was no justification for rejection of the respondents application under the aforesaid Scheme on the ground that they had been received late.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the effect of the impugned order would be that the wards of the respondents would be entitled to appointment under the Scheme.

In our view, that is no reason to assail the impugned order. No ground has been disclosed as to how the impugned order is claimed to be laconic. There is no dispute raised with regard to the facts taken note of by the tribunal in the impugned order. We do not find any merit in this petition.

Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

DEEPA SHARMA, J

MAY 29, 2017

sr