

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench**

OA 310/01695/2019

Dated Thursday the 19th day of December Two Thousand Nineteen

P R E S E N T

**Hon'ble Shri. P. Madhavan, Member (J)
&
Hon'ble Shri. T. Jacob, Member (A)**

M. V. Arumugam
S/o. Veerasamy
Postman (Retired)
Kattangkulathur
at Korkanthangal
No. 12, Main Road Chengleput
Chengleput – 603 203.Applicant

By Advocate M/s. G. Ravisankar

Vs

1. Union of India
Rep. By the Postmaster General
City Region
Regional Office
Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002.

2. The Postmaster General
(Principal)
Anna Salai
Chennai – 600 002.

3. The Superintendent of Post Office
Chinglepattu Division
Chinglepattu 603 001.Respondents

By Advocate Mr. Su. Srinivasan

ORAL ORDER

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Member(J)

The applicant has filed this OA under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

“To set aside the order of the 3rd respondent dated 04.09.2019 and made in No. E11/ROHSC/MVA/Dlgs and direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 4,33,487/- with interest @ 12% per annum from the date of medical claim made by the applicant till the disbursement of the said amount and render justice.”

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant being retired Postman got admitted in Appollo Hospital for emergency surgery. The applicant submitted application on 21.10.2013 claiming reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by him to the tune of Rs. 4,33,487/-, but the 3rd respondent rejected the claim of the applicant by an order dated 04.09.2009 which does not contain any relevant material to know what is the reason for rejection of the applicant's claim and it is very cryptic order. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant will be satisfied if he is permitted to give a fresh representation to the respondents regarding his grievance and the competent authority is directed to dispose of the said representation within a time frame.

3. Mr. Su. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and submits that the respondents have no objection for disposal of the representation of the applicant on merits.

4. We have perused the pleadings. It seems that the impugned order is very cryptic. **Hence in view of the limited submission made and without going into the substantive merits of the case, We deem it appropriate to direct the applicant to file a detailed fresh representation to the respondents quoting the relevant rules on the subject within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order and the competent authority is directed to consider and dispose of the said representation by passing a speaking order in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of such representation.**

5. OA is disposed of at the admission stage.

(T. Jacob)
Member(A)
AS

19.12.2019

(P. Madhavan)
Member (J)