

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK**

**Original Application No. 929 of 2013**  
Cuttack, this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2014

CORAM  
**HON'BLE MR. A.K. PATNAIK, MEMBER (Judl.)**  
**HON'BLE MR. R.C. MISRA, MEMBER (Admn.)**

Pramod Ranjan Boe,  
aged about 27 years,  
Son of Late Iswar Boe,  
At/PO- Chatuanka,  
Via- Kantabanjhi,  
Dist.- Bolangir.

.....Applicant

Advocate(s)... M/s. S.K.Joshi, S. Behera, B.K.Panda .

**VERSUS**

Union of India represented through

1. Secretary,  
Ministry of Telecommunication Department,  
New Delhi- 110001.
2. Chief General Manager,  
Telecommunication, B.S.N.L.,  
Odisha Circle, Bhubaneswar,  
Dist - Khurda.
3. Telecom District Manager,  
Bolangir,  
At/PO/Dist- Bolangir

..... Respondents

Advocate(s)..... Mr. S.B.Jena

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**MR. A.K.PATNAIK, MEMBER (JUDL.):**

Heard Mr. S.K.Joshi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, and Mr. S.B.Jena, Ld. Counsel who usually appears for the BSNL. Accordingly, on our direction, Mr. Jena accepts notice on behalf of the Respondents. Registry is directed to serve notice, in terms of Sub rule 4 of Rule 11 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987 for onward transmission.



2. We find that the O.A. has been filed by the applicant under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 challenging the order of rejection passed by the Asst. General Manager (CM) vide order dated 21.08.2012 under Annexure-A/6 on behalf of the Telecom District Manager, Bolangir (Respondent No.3) in which it has been stated as follows:

“It has been intimated by the Circle Office, Bhubaneswar vide its Letter No. quoted above that, your request for Compassionate Ground Appointment (CGA) has been rejected by the Circle High Power Committee.”

We find that this order is a quite cryptic one. Copy of the letter referred in the letter dated 21.08.2012 has not been supplied to the applicant. We have taken note that while the father of the applicant was in service died on 14.12.2002 leaving behind three sons and three daughters. The case of the applicant was considered only during 2012, i.e. after a long period of 10 years, and that too has been rejected by a cryptic order. Accordingly, we quash the order dated 21.08.2012 and remand the matter back to the concerned authority for reconsideration of the applicant's case by taking into account the indigent condition prevailing at the time of death of his father, i.e. on 14.12.2002, and communicate the result thereof by way of a well reasoned order within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

3. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this O.A stands disposed of at the stage of admission itself.

4. Copy of this order be sent to Respondent No.3.

  
MEMBER (Admn.)

  
MEMBER (Judl.)