

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/020/261/2021**

HYDERABAD, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021

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



1. Nelapati Mariayamma,  
W/o. Late Venkaiah,  
aged about 59 years,  
Ex. Hd Waiter/comml/S.C Rly.  
Vijayawada, Door No.23-137,  
Vijay Bhaskar Nagar - Peddakakani,  
Nambur (P) Guntur – AP.
2. Nelapati Ashok, S/o. Late Venkaiah,  
aged about 32 years,  
Ex. Hd Waiter/comml/S.C Rly.  
Vijayawada, Door No.23-137,  
Vijay Bhaskar Nagar - Peddakakani,  
Nambur (P) Guntur – AP.

...Applicants

(By Advocate : Sri B. Rajesh Kumar)

Vs.

1. Union of India,  
Ministry of Railways rep. by its  
The General Manager,  
South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam,  
Secunderabad -AP.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Vijayawada Division, Vijayawada –AP.
3. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,  
South Central Railway,  
Vijayawada Division, Vijayawada –AP.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Sri M. Venkateswarlu, SC for Rlys.)

---

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member)**

The present O.A. is filed seeking the following reliefs:



“i) to declare the action of respondents are illegal for making unsound attitude and that, the respondents may kindly be directed to consider the applicants claim for compassionate ground appointment under the instructions of Rly. Boards letter No. E (NG)II/2014/RC-1/SCR/5 dated 08-07-2014 bearing RBE No.70/2014 and dispose the representation dated 17-02-2021 admission itself by consideration reliefs as prayed for

ii) That the respondents may further be directed to set aside the impugned order issued by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent vide No. B/P.Con.564/III/178/2011 dated 27-02-2013 and consider the claim of the applicant and other relevant benefits and other remedies arising thereto; and pass such other orders or issue such other directions as this Hon Tribunal deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and equity, and in the favor of the applicant and against the respondents.”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicants are the Class-I legal heirs of the deceased Railway employee, who died in harness on 22.11.2009. He left behind his wife and two sons. Later, his elder son also died. The deceased employee has three married daughters also. None of them sought compassionate appointment except the 2<sup>nd</sup> applicant, who is the younger son of the deceased employee. His request was rejected by the respondents on the ground that he is married. He has cited Railway Board's Circular dated 8.7.2014 which is stated to have been in his favour. The applicant has made a detailed representation dated 1.9.2018. The same has not been considered by the respondents as alleged by the applicant.

3. Heard Sri B. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicants. Sri M. Venkateswarlu, learned Standing Counsel put appearance and advanced his arguments.

4. In view of the fact that the representation of the applicant is pending with the respondent authorities, we hereby direct the respondents to dispose of the same with a speaking order within a period of 6 weeks from the date of receipt of this order. In case the applicant is still aggrieved, he may re-approach this Tribunal for redressal of his grievance.

5. With the above observation, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage without looking into the merits of the case. No order as to costs.

**(B.V. SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

*/pv/*

