

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/021/175/2021

HYDERABAD, this the 3rd day of March, 2021



**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**

Pallapu Radha, D/o. Late Pallapu Sambasiva Rao,
W/o. K. Vamana Murthy,
Aged 39 years, (Gr. C),
Occ: Housewife, Presently residing at
Plot No.71, Road No.3/6, Haripuri Colony,
Near Ayyappa Real Estates, Kothapet,
Hyderabad – 500 035, Telangana.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Sri Irugu Munniraja)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by its
The General Manager,
South Central Railway,
12, Krishna Deva Raya Rd,
Lalaguda, Mettuguda,
Secunderabad – 500017, Telangana.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Office,
South Central Railway,
Vijayawada – 520 010, AP.
3. The Senior Divisional Material Manager,
Divisional Office, South Central Railway,
Vijayawada -520 010, A.P.
4. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
Divisional Office, Personnel Branch,
South Central Railway,
Vijayawada – 520 010, A.P.
5. The Divisional Manager,
Divisional Office, Personnel Branch,
South Central Railway,
Vijayawada – 520 010, A.P.

6. Smt Pallapu Venkata Ramana,
W/o. Late Pallapu Sambasiva Rao,
C/o. Battula Naveena, Aged about 55 years,
Occ; House-wife, R/o. D.No.21-12-6,
Kolasanyasi Rao Street, Kobbarithota,
Madhurangar, Vijayawada – 520 015, AP.



7. Pallapu Rajasekhar,
S/o. Late P. Sambasiva Rao,
Aged about 36 years,
Occ: Railway Goods Guard,
R/o. D.No.42-55-8, Old Post Office Road,
Ajit Singh Nagar, Vijayawada – 520 015, A.P.

8. Battula Naveena,
D/o. Late P. Sambasiva Rao,
Wo. Sasi Kumar, aged about 31 years,
House-wife, R/o. 21-12-6,
Kolasanyasi Rao Street, Kobbarithota,
Madhuranagar, Vijayawada – 520 015, A.P.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Sri Bheem Singh for Sri M. Brahma Reddy, SC for Rlys.)

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



2. The OA is filed with a prayer to direct the respondents 1 to 5 to pay the death benefits of the deceased employee Pallapu Sambasiva Rao and for compassionate appointment to the applicant.

3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicant is the daughter of the deceased employee Pallapu Sambasiva Rao, who passed away on 23.11.2016 while working for the respondents organisation as K.H. Helper. The ex-employee had 2 wives and children through them. Applicant is the daughter of the 1st wife. Applicant has represented several times to settle the terminal benefits and grant compassionate appointment by enclosing the relevant documents substantiating her claim over the others. However, the respondents have not taken any favourable action and hence the OA.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that she is eligible to be granted the terminal benefits, since she is the daughter of the deceased employee. Her name is duly entered in the official records of the respondents. Competent court in its decree and judgment dt. 09.10.2017 in OS No. 737/2017 declared the applicant, respondents 6 to 8 to be the legal heirs of the deceased employee. But the respondents 1 to 5 acted contrary to the said decree and judgment and credited the amounts to the accounts of the respondents 6 & 7, but not the applicant and the 8th respondent.

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

6. The dispute is about non grant of terminal benefits and compassionate appointment to the applicant by the respondents. Applicant

is reported to be the daughter of the first wife of the deceased employee who died in harness on 23.11.2016. On the death of her father, applicant made a claim for terminal benefits and compassionate appointment and they were not granted despite several representations, the last one having been dated 09.03.2020 (Page Nos.14-19 of the OA). Applicant claims that she has submitted relevant documents and prays for the disposal of the representation. Considering the prayer made, the respondents are directed to dispose of the representation cited as per rules and in accordance with law, by issuing a speaking and reasoned order within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

With the above direction the OA is disposed at the admission stage, while making it clear that we have not gone into the merits of the case. No order as to costs.



(B.V.SUDHAKAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

/evr/