

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

*Date of Order: March 07, 2018*

+ **W.P.(C) 2097/2018 & CMs 8684-85/2018**

TIRATH GODAR CHETTRI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sulaiman Mohd. Khan, Mr.  
Tribikram Meelee and Mr. Mohit Prasad,  
Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. .... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC and  
Mr. Gaurav Rohilla, Advocate for respondents  
No.1 to 3

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR**

**ORDER**

**(ORAL)**

1. Petitioner had sought compassionate appointment as a Plumber on death of his father on 5<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 and his application was recommended by Western Command vide Communication of 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 (*Annexure-E*). Thereafter, petitioner had sought Court of Inquiry Report vide letter of 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 (*Annexure-I*). Petitioner had also sought information under RTI on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 regarding death of his father and on 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, vide Representation (*Annexure-P Colly*), petitioner had sought grant of compensation or appointment on compassionate grounds. The said Representation was forwarded by the concerned Administrative Officer, but according to petitioner's counsel, there is no response to the said Representation. It is further submitted that again on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, another Representation

(*Annexure-P colly.*) was sent to third respondent and the fate of this Representation is also not known till date.

2. Vide Communication of 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 (*Annexure-F*), petitioner was permitted to retain the official accommodation for a period of 24 months. Petitioner's counsel submits that till petitioner's Representation of 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 (*Annexure-P colly.*) is decided, petitioner be permitted to retain the official accommodation. This prayer is declined for the reason that petitioner in the first instant has sought compensation and in the alternate, has sought appointment on compassionate grounds. Another reason for declining this prayer is that petitioner had not been diligently pursuing the Representation of April, 2016.

3. In the facts and circumstances of this case, it is deemed appropriate to dispose of this petition with direction to third respondent to deal with petitioner's Representation of 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 (*Annexure-P colly.*) by passing a speaking order thereon within a period of six weeks and the fate of the Representation be made known to petitioner within a week thereafter, so that petitioner may avail of the remedies as available in law, if need be.

4. With aforesaid directions, this petition and the applications are disposed of.

*Dasti.*

**(SUNIL GAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**MARCH 07, 2018**

S