

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/021/01031/2019

HYDERABAD, this the 28th day of November, 2019

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

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

NENAVATH SUMITRA,
D/o Late N H Nayak,
Age 33 years,
Ex. MTS, Lallaguda P.O,
Secunderabad Division,
R/o H.No.16-30/5, Adarshanagar Colony,
Jawaharnagar, J.J.Nagar,
Hyderabad.

APPLICANT



(By advocate: Mr. M Venkanna)

Vs.

1. The Union of India represented by
Secretary, Govt. of India,
Ministry of Communications and I.T,
Department of Posts-India, Dak Bhavan,
Sansad Marg, New Delhi-110 001,
- 2 The Chief Post Master General,
Telangana Circle,
Hyderabad 500 001,
3. The Senior Superintendent of
Post Offices,
Secunderabad Division,
Hyderabad 500 080.

RESPONDENTS

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

ORAL ORDER

(PER HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY,
CHAIRMAN)

Father of applicant herein was working as Multi Tasking Staff (MTS) in Department of Posts. He died in 2016 while in service. Applicant claims to be divorced daughter of the deceased employee. She made an application with a request to provide employment on compassionate grounds. Respondents considered the case of applicant and several others and the Circle Relaxation Committee (CRC) met on 27.06.2019 and on 17.07.2019. A list of 46 candidates who could not be accommodated at that point of time, was released and applicant figured at Sl.No.16. In the proceedings, it was mentioned that their cases would be reconsidered in the next departmental CRC.

2. This OA was filed with a prayer to direct respondents to reconsider the case of applicant, by applying the rule of reservation, since she belongs to Scheduled Tribe category.

3. Heard Mr. ABLN Pavan Kumar, proxy counsel for Mr. M.Venkanna for applicant and Mrs. K.Rajitha, learned senior standing counsel for respondents.

4. Case of applicant is already under consideration and she has to wait for her turn. Department has its own norms and rules to be followed in the context of providing appointment on compassionate grounds. The emphasis of applicant seems to claim reservation.



5. The facility of appointment on compassionate grounds itself is not under the statutory provision, but under a scheme evolved by Hon'ble Supreme Court. The question of applying any reservation in that process, does not arise.

6. We, therefore, dispose of OA at the stage of admission directing respondents to consider the case of applicant as and when her turn comes, in accordance with the existing procedure and the scheme.

7. There shall be no order as to costs.



vsn

(B V SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN