

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/021/215/2021

HYDERABAD, this the 9th day of March, 2021

Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member

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



1. T. Manikyam, W/o. Late T. Krupanandam,
Aged about 50 years,
Ex. Keyman/P.Way/S/Bza, Door No.17-21-9E,
Behind RCM Church, Allauddhin Street,
Pezzonipetpet, Vijayawada –AP.
2. T. Maria Kumar, S/o. Late T. Krupanandam,
Aged about 32 years,
Ex. Keyman/P.Way/s/Bza, Door No.17-21-9E,
Behind RCM Church, Allauddhin Street,
Pezzonipetpet, Vijayawada – AP.
3. T. @ Medi Chinna Lakshmi (1st wife daughter),
D/o. Late T. Krupanandam and W/o Krishna,
H.No.3975, Enkoor Mandal and post,
SC Colony – Khammam, Telangana, India (IN),
Pin Code – 507 168.

...Applicants

(By Advocate: Sri B. Rajesh Kumar)

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Ministry of Railways rep. by its
The Secretary (Estt. (N)),
Railway Board -Raisina Road.
2. The General Manager,
South Central Railway,
Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad – Telangana State.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
South Central Railway, Vijayawada Division – AP.
4. The Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer,
South Central Railway,
Vijayawada Division – AP.

....Respondents

(By Advocate: Smt. Vijaya Sagi, SC for Railways)

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

Through Video Conferencing:



2. The OA is filed with a prayer to direct the respondents to consider the case of the 2nd applicant for compassionate appointment.

3. Brief facts of the case are that the first applicant is seeking compassionate appointment for the 2nd applicant on the demise of her husband while working as Keyman in the respondents' organization in 2006. The deceased employee married the 1st applicant after the demise of the first wife through whom he was blessed with 2 daughters and the deceased employee has entered the names of the 2 daughters and the 1st & 2nd applicants in the Railway records. Despite the 2nd applicant being eligible for compassionate appointment, respondents are not considering the same since the last 8 years and hence, the OA.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that Pension and terminal benefits were released to the 1st applicant. The name of the applicants were shown as nominee of the deceased employee in the Railway records like Railway Pass, Railway Cooperative Credit Society and in the family member certificate issued by the MRO. The request for compassionate appointment is pending since last 8 years and hence, representation was submitted on 11.04.2020 which has not been disposed of.

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

6. The dispute is about non grant of compassionate appointment. The first applicant claims that the pension and terminal benefits were released to her after the demise of her husband who worked for the respondents.

Applicants claim is that their names are recorded in the railway records and that the 2nd applicant is fully eligible for compassionate appointment. However, though request was made 8 years ago, yet a decision was not taken by the respondents is the claim of the 1st applicant. Hence, a representation was made on 11.4.2020, which has not been processed. The Ld. Counsel for the applicants sought disposal of the representation. The request is acceded to and the respondents are directed to dispose of the representation dated 11.04.2020 by issuing a speaking and reasoned order within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of this order as per extent rules and in accordance with law.



With the above direction, the OA is disposed of, without going into the merits of the case, at the admission stage. No costs.

(B.V.SUDHAKAR)
ADMINISTRATIVEMEMBER

(ASHISH KALIA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

/evr/