

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MADRAS BENCH**

**OA No.310/00123/2014**

**Dated Thursday the 6<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2020**

**P R E S E N T**

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

Priyatharisini  
No. 2A, Madhamandapam Street  
Nagalapuram Road  
Uthukottai  
Tiruvallur Dt.  
T. Nadu Pin 602 026.

... Applicant

By Advocate M/s G. Thyagarajan

Vs

1. The Chief Postmaster General  
Chennai City Region  
Tamil Nadu Circle  
Chennai – 600 002.  
2. The Postmaster General  
Tamil Nadu Circle  
Chennai – 600 002.  
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices  
Kanchipuram Division  
Kanchipuram – 631 501.

...Respondents

By Advocate Dr. G. Krishnamurthy

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

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

- “i. To pass an order holding that the order of the respondent department vide No.REP/KCM-MISC/03/CCR dated at Chennai – 600 002 the 05.12.2013 is unsustainable and bad in law and to call for the records and quash the order of the same consequently direct the respondent for the appointment of the applicant herein on compassionate grounds with all the contingent benefits such as gratuity and PF etc., and thus render justice.
- ii. To direct the respondents to calculate the left out subsistence allowance from 6 months from the date of suspension to the date of dismissal from service of the deceased employee, and to pay the accrued amount of subsistence allowance to the applicant herein in the interest of justice.
- iii. Any such further or other order .”

2. The applicant is the wife of deceased Mr.Ravannan who worked with the respondent department as a Sub-Post Master. While so, a criminal case was registered against him and he was suspended and initially he was given subsistence allowance and subsequently the same was denied and hence he could not appoint defence helper in the departmental enquiry which ended in his dismissal from service on 26.12.2010. The contention of the applicant is that the departmental enquiry was not conducted properly and since her husband also died on 26.01.2013, she is claiming compassionate appointment and other benefits and hence this OA.

3. When the matter came up for hearing, learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the **applicant is limiting his prayer to compassionate allowance** alone and she has give a representation to the department for the same on 03.02.2020 after filing of this OA. She will be satisfied if her representation is considered sympathetically and orders are passed., within a stipulated time limit.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents is served with the copy of the representation dated 03.02.2020 in open court. He submits that the

respondents have no objection for disposal of the representation of the applicant on merits.

5. In view of the limited relief sought and the fact that he is not pressing for any other relief except compassionate allowance, without going into the merits of the case, the OA is disposed of in the following lines:

**"The competent authority is directed to consider the representation of the applicant dated 03.02.2020 on the basis of the relevant rules and regulations and pass a reasoned and speaking order, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. "**

**(T.JACOB)  
MEMBER (A)**

**06.02.2020**

**(P.MADHAVAN)  
MEMBER (J)**

M.T.