

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**Original Application No.21/1163/2019**

**Hyderabad, this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2019**

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



1. Smt. T. Vijaya Lakshmi,  
W/o. late T.K. Ramana Chari,  
Aged about 59 years, Occ: Ex.GDSMC/PKR,  
Yellandu Colls, Yellandu Sub division,  
Khammam Division, Yellandu – 507 124,  
Khammam District.
2. T. Sarveswarachari,  
W/o. late T.K. Ramana Chari,  
Aged about 32 years, Occ: Ex.GDSMC/PKR,  
Yellandu Colls, Yellandu Sub division,  
Khammam Division, Yellandu – 507 124,  
Khammam District.

... Applicants

(By Advocate Mr. G. Jaya Prakash Babu)

Vs.

1. Union of India, Represented by its Secretary,  
Ministry of Communications and Information Technology,  
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,  
Telangana Circle, Abids, Hyderabad -1.
3. Director of Postal Services,  
O/o. Post Master General,  
Hyderabad Region, Abids, Hyderabad.
4. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Khammam Division, Khammam – 507 003,  
Khammam District.
5. The Asst. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Kothagudem Sub Division,  
Kothagudem – 507 101, Khammam District.

... Respondents

(By Advocates: Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC)

**ORDER (ORAL)**  
**{As per Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}**

2. OA is filed challenging the Memo dated 12.3.2018 rejecting the claim for compassionate appointment.



3. Brief facts of the case are that the 2<sup>nd</sup> applicant preferred an application for compassionate appointment on the death of his father who passed away on 25.8.2010 while working as Grameen Dak Sewak in the respondents organisation. The application was rejected on 16.3.2016 on grounds that the applicant got less than 36 points. Applicant represented on 29.11.2017 to furnish the details of the points allotted but without responding the same, respondents issued the impugned order dated 12.3.2018. Aggrieved, OA has been filed.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that the point system has undergone changes and that the case of the applicant has to be considered as per the prevailing system. Family is in financial distress. As per Hon'ble Apex Court directions, cases of compassionate appointment have to be decided without delay based on the indigent circumstances in which the family is placed. Guidelines on the subject have not been followed. There is no time limit to consider requests for compassionate appointments. Applicant, who is a dependent family member, is eligible for compassionate appointment as per rules and regulations.

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

6. Applicant represented for compassionate appointment on the demise of his father, which was rejected vide impugned order dated 12.3.2018. The



impugned order does not give any reasons for rejection except to state that the applicant can make any appeal to the Director of Postal Services. The ground stated by the applicant in the OA was that his case was rejected for not securing the requisite merit points of 36. If this be so, the impugned order should have clearly stated the points allotted to the applicant on different attributes and the points obtained by other successful candidates, who were considered along with the applicant, so that the applicant is aware of the specific reason for which he was not considered. Applicant requested for the said details but the respondents did not respond to the same. It is well settled in law that, an order devoid of reason is an invalid order. The applicant has also further represented on 11.2.2019, which is yet to be disposed. Learned counsel pleaded that the representation be disposed.

7. After hearing both the counsel, this Tribunal deems it fit and proper to dispose of the OA by directing the respondents to dispose of the representation of the applicant dated 11.2.2019, within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of the order, by issuing a speaking and reasoned order by responding to each of the issues raised in the said representation. OA is accordingly disposed, at the admission stage itself, with no order as to costs.

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

/evr/