CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

OA/020/347/2020

HYDERABAD, this the 15th day of July, 2020

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

Penumudi Mohan Rao, Gr. "C",
Aged about 42 years, Occ: Unemployee,
S/o. Late P. Devasahayam, Ex. EDMC/DA,
Adavuladeevi BO, a/w. Kuchinapudi SO,
TenaliDivn., R/o. Adavuladeevi Vil.& Post,
NizampatnamMandal, Kuchinapudi SO – 522 262,
Guntur District, A.P.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. B. Gurudas)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by
The Secretary, Govt. of India,
MOC & IT., Dept. of Posts,
SansadMarg, New Delhi -110 001.

2. The Chief Post Master General,
A.P. Circle, Vijayawada,
Vijayawada – 520 001,
Krishna District, A.P.

3. The Postmaster General,
Vijayawada Region,
Vijayawada– 520 001,
Krishna District, A.P.

4. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Tenali Division, Tenali Post,
Guntur District, A.P.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC
forMs. K. Bharathi, Addl.CGSC)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'bleMr.B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member

Through Video Conferencing

The O.A. is filed in regard to denying compassionate appointment to the applicant. The case of the applicant is that compassionate appointment has been denied to him, though he is eligible as per the relevant rules of the respondent's organization. Aggrieved over the same, the O.A. has been filed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the father of the applicant late Sri P. Devasahayam, while working as GDS Mail Deliverer/ MC, Adavuladeevi BO, a/w Kuchnapudi S.O. in Tenali Division, died on 14.10.2010, leaving behind three family members. The contention of the applicant is that his request for compassionate appointment was rejected without properly assessing the circumstances in which he is placed. The applicant's family is in indigent circumstances. Besides, the respondents themselves have reviewed and revised the guidelines for compassionate appointment. The contention of the applicant is that as per the latest guidelines, he is eligible to be considered for compassionate appointment.

3. Heard Sri B. Gurudas, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. K. Rajitha, learned Sr. CGSC representing the learned counsel for the respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the respondents have revised the guidelines for compassionate appointment in 2012, 2015 &

2017. He has submitted that a number of cases have been filed in the Tribunal wherein it was directed that the cases of compassionate appointment be considered as per the latest guidelines. Learned counsel for the applicant has also stated that in view of the repeated directions of the Tribunal, it appears that the respondents have reviewed the instructions in regard to the Scheme of compassionate appointment and issued instructions vide letter dated 05.03.2020. It is evident from the said letter that the respondents have directed the subordinate formations to reconsider all the cases of compassionate appointment, which have come up for consideration from 2005 to May 2017, as a one-time measure.

5. In view of the above direction of the 1st respondent, it would be proper and appropriate to direct the respondents to re-consider the case of the applicant for compassionate appointment in the light of the instructions contained in letter dated 05.03.2020 of the respondents, within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The respondents are directed accordingly. After examining the case of the applicant, the respondents shall issue a speaking and reasoned order as deemed fit in the case. Even thereafter, if the applicant is still aggrieved, he is at liberty to approach this Tribunal, if he is so advised.

6. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
ADMN.MEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDL. MEMBER

/pv/