

Amitabh Kumar and Another

Vs

Director of Estates and Another

SLP (C) No. 3338 of 1997

03.02.1997

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.

2. The second petitioner, admittedly, has retired from service. Before his retirement, the first petitioner, his son had applied for allotment of the house in substitution of the father. Undoubtedly, the allotment could not be made within the time asked for. Initially, the Department extended the time, as sought for by four months but on expiry thereof, he did not vacate the premises. Consequently, the order of extension was withdrawn. As a result, the first petitioner remained unauthorisedly in occupation for which he was directed to pay penal rentals. The petitioner have questioned the correctness of the orders in the Tribunal. The Tribunal in the impugned order dated 28-8-1996 dismissed OA No. 132 of 1996.

3. Shri Mahabir Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, contends that the 2nd petitioner is eligible to apply for allotment in substitution of his father. Since the issue of allotment to which he is eligible was not determined for long and the delay was on the part of the respondent-Government, the penal rentals cannot be imposed upon them. We find no force in the contention. It is seen that under the ad hoc allotment rules issued in Memo No. 12035 dated 9-11-1987, Item (ii) deals with ad hoc allotment to the dependent of the officer who seeks voluntary retirement. It provides that dependant of an officer who seek voluntary retirement would also be eligible for ad hoc allotment subject to the fulfilment of the other prescribed conditions given in the orders regarding ad hoc allotment/regularisation on retirement of government servants. Item (viii) postulates date of regularisation and provides that "the date of regularisation should be from the date of cancellation in case the eligible dependant is already in government service and is entitled for regularisation and not from the date of issue of the orders which was the practice being followed till now". In other words, even if the allottee is in possession of government accommodation, it may be regularised. However, the government employee who is in unauthorised occupation is required to pay penal rentals. It is contended that since the father was to entire and his son was and is entitled to the ad hoc allotment, adjudication of the application made by Petitioner 2 could not be charged. We find no force in the contention. It is seen that the entitlement to which the son is eligible is different from the entitlement to which the father was eligible. Therefore, the mere fact that the application had been made for ad hoc allotment on the basis of the fact that the son was in government service, does not make any difference. Obviously, the first petitioner was in unauthorised occupation, as a consequence, under the rules he is required to pay the penal rentals. Under these circumstances, we find no force in the contention and the Tribunal's order does not warrant interference. Two months' time is granted from today for payment of penal rentals.

4. The Special leave petition is accordingly dismissed.