

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

Original Application No.21/187/2019

Hyderabad, this the 3rd day of January, 2020



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

K. Lalitha, W/o. late K. Maniya,
Aged about 51 years, Housewife,
R/o. H. No. 18-2-197/237,
Ravindranayak Nagar Colony,
Falaknuma, Hyderabad.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. K. Ram Reddy)

Vs.

Union of India, Rep. by its

1. The Deputy Director General,
Southern Region,
Geological Survey of India,
Hyderabad.
2. The Additional Director General &
Head of Department, Southern Region Office,
Geological Survey of India, Hyderabad.
3. The Executive Engineer & Head of Office,
Government of India, Remote Sensing and
Aerial Survey, Vasudha Bhavan,
Kumaraswamy Layout, Bangalore.

... Respondents

(By Advocates: Mr. T. Sri Varaha Laxmi Narasimha Swamy, Addl. CGSC)

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

2. The OA is filed in regard to consideration of the applicant for compassionate appointment.



3. Applicant preferred an application for compassionate appointment consequent to the demise of her husband while working for the respondent's organisation as Driver on 16.11.2008. In response, respondents informed that the applicant was placed at Sl. 19 to consider her case for compassionate appointment on 16.6.2011, at Sl. 4 on 30.7.2012 and finally, on 24.3.2016 she was asked to re-apply as she stood at Sl. 10 by obtaining 70 points and there being only one post available. Applicant has re-applied, but there being no response, though more than 2 years have lapsed, OA has been filed.

4. The contention of the applicant is that she is eligible for compassionate appointment.

5. Respondents inform that the case of the applicant was considered on 3 occasions as per Rules, but she could not be selected because of relative merit and availability of vacancies.

6. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and perused the pleadings on record. Learned counsel for the respondents was absent.

7. As per the reply statement, respondents have considered the case of the applicant on three occasions in the years 2011, 2012 and 2016 but she could not be selected based on relative merit and availability of vacancies. Respondents have evaluated the cases received on a 100 point scale and

those who had higher merit points, it appears, have been offered compassionate appointment. However, in 2016, when the applicant who stood at Sl. 10 by obtaining 70 merit points could not be considered for lack of vacancies, she was advised to re-apply. Applicant claims that she has re-applied. As proof of making an application to the Director General, applicant has submitted the speed post booking receipt with the date manually written as 18.4.2016. Respondents inform that after 2016 no vacancies arose under compassionate recruitment quota and hence no compassionate appointments were made. In view of the submission made by the respondents, the case of the applicant may be considered as and when a vacancy arises as per extent Rules provided respondents, as per records, find that the applicant had made an application, as directed within 30 days of the order passed by the respondents on 24.3.2016.



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

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

/evr/