

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH**

OA 310/01522/2015

Dated Monday the 2nd day of November Two Thousand Fifteen

P R E S E N T

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SESHASAYANA REDDY, Member (J)
&
HON'BLE DR. P. PRABAKARAN, Member(A)**

S. Hariharan,
Pass Guard/MDU (Retd)
173, Ramasamy Asari Street,
Traveller's Bungalow (opp),
Sivagangai Main Road,
Manamadurai- 630 606
Sivagangai District.

... Applicant

By Advocate : M/s. E. Thurairaaaj

Vs.

Union of India represented by

1. The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Poonthamalli High Road,
Near Park Town,
Chennai-3;
2. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway,
Madurai. ... Respondents

By Advocate :Mr. P. Srinivasan

ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Seshasayana Reddy, Member(J))

Applicant is a retired employee of the respondents department. While in service he married one Parvathy. He included the name of Parvathy in the Service Register. The said Parvathy fell sick and she was not able to procure children. He married 2nd wife, Kannagi with the consent of his first wife on 10.06.1988. The 2nd wife begot three children out of the wedlock. His first wife passed away on 08.12.2008. He submitted a representation to the respondents to include the name of his 2nd wife in the Service Register. Despite his repeated requests and representations, respondents failed to include the name of 2nd wife in the Service Register. Hence, he approached this Tribunal invoking the jurisdiction under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act 1985 seeking direction to the respondents to consider his representations dated 12.12.2014 and 16.08.2010.

2. When this O.A. came up for admission, P. Srinivasan, Learned Standing Counsel for southern Railway accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
3. Heard learned counsel appearing for the applicant and learned counsel appearing for the respondents.
4. The limited grievance of the applicant is non-consideration of his representations submitted to the respondents for inclusion of his 2nd wife in the Service Register.

B. S. Reddy

5. In that view of the matter, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondents to consider representation dated 12.12.2014 and 16.08.2014 and pass appropriate orders within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of the order . There shall be no order as to costs.