
(2002) 12 PAT CK 0022
In the Patna High Court
Case No : C.W.J.C. No. 13616 of 2002

Mangli Devi

APPELLANT

Vs

The Union of India (UOI) and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-12-2002

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2003) 1 PLJR 556

Hon'ble Judges : Ravi S. Dhavan, C.J;R.N. Prasad, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Surendra Kishore Thakur, for the Appellant; J.P. Karn, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. It would have been appropriate if this writ petition had never been filed. The Petitioner Mangli Devi challenges the order of the Central

Administrative Tribunal dated 10 September, 2002 arising out of a case O.A. No. 22 of 2000: Mangli Devi v. Union of India and two Ors.

2. The reason why the Court has observed that it would have been appropriate that this writ petition should never have been filed is that this is not

a matter which ought to be a lawyer's brief. The issue as presented by the Central Administrative Tribunal is a mess of between lovers and

mistresses and amorous adventures of a twice married man and woman, of retirement benefits by a person who asserts herself as a widow and

claims more a compassionate appointment from the railways Counsel says that the Petitioner is facing a counter claim from the railway

administration to return what she has received.

3. The facts noticed by the Tribunal in paragraphs 2 and 4 are relevant. The

Tribunal notices that the Petitioner Mangli Devi was married to one Baidynath Tanti. She left him. Thereafter she married one Rajendra Tanti. She left him also because she discovered that he was already married to someone else. Thereafter, she claims a marriage to late Ram Khelawan (a railway employee) whose first wife had died. Further, the Tribunal notices that so far as the deceased railway employee Ram Khelawan is concerned, he married the Appellant when she had two husbands living and she had neither been separated nor divorced from them. The railway administration considered the claimed marriage of the deceased employee Ram Khelawan with the Appellant Mangli Devi as void. The railway administration submitted before the Tribunal that any entry in the official records of the railway is on the declaration of the employee.

4. The Court would not like to interfere in this matter.

5. Dismissed.