

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

Original Application No.20/39/2020

Hyderabad, this the 10th day of January, 2020



Hon'ble Mr. B. V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)

Shri Nemalipuri Chandrasekhar,
S/o. late Shri N. Suryanarayana,
Aged about 42 years, 208 Colony,
Kinchumanda BO, A/w. Araku RS SO – 531 151,
Visakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. G. Jaya Prakash Babu)

Vs.

1. Union of India, Rep. by Secretary,
Ministry of Communication & Information Technology,
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan,
Sansad Marg, New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
AP Circle, Vijayawada.
3. Postmaster General,
Visakhapatnam Region, Visakhapatnam.
4. Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices,
Anakapalli Division, Anakapalli – 531 001.

... Respondents

(By Advocates: Mr. B. Venkanna, Proxy counsel
representing Mr. A. Radha Krishna, Sr.PC for CG)

ORDER (ORAL)
{As per B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}

2. The OA is filed challenging the proceedings dated 15.3.2016 and not disposing the representation dated 28.8.2019 in regard to compassionate appointment.



3. Brief facts are that, when the father of the applicant died in harness on 17.5.2014 while working for the respondents as Grameen Dak Sewak-Mail Carrier, applicant preferred an application for compassionate appointment in 2015, which was rejected on 15.3.2016 for not obtaining required merit points. Thereafter, a representation was made on 28.8.2019 to consider his case as the family of the deceased employee was in distress. There being no response, the OA has been filed.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that the impugned order is not a speaking and a reasoned order. The family is in distress and is badly in need of compassionate appointment. Representation made on 28.8.2019 has not been disposed. Respondents have dispensed the point system on 30.5.2017. Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that compassionate appointments have to be offered based on the indigent circumstances of the family and that there should not be any delay in processing them. There is no time limit in applying for compassionate appointment as per DOPT memos dated 26.7.2012 and 16.1.2013. Applicant is relying on the decision of this Tribunal in OA 1140 of 2016 in support of his contentions.

5. Heard both the counsel and perused the pleadings on record.

6. I) The learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the respondents be directed to dispose of the representation made on 28.8.2019. Generally respondents are expected to dispose of the representations received at the earliest. The impugned order dated 15.3.2016 is cryptic without specifying the detailed reasons required. After hearing both the sides, Tribunal is of the view that the ends of justice would be met by directing the respondents to dispose of the representation made on 28.8.2019, keeping in view the relevant rules and regulations and the decision of this Tribunal in OA 1140/2016, within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of this order, by issuing a speaking and well reasoned order. Suffice to state that the Tribunal has not gone into the merits of the case.

With the above direction, the OA is disposed of at the admission stage, with no order as to costs.

**(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)**

/evr/

