

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM

O. A. No. 533

1990

T. A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 1.10.90

K. E. Stanislaus Teddy Applicant (s)

Mr. M. Ramechandran Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus

U.O.I. rep. by Secretary, CBE&C, New Delhi and others Respondent (s)

Mr. N. N. Sugunapalan Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. N. V. Krishnan, Administrative Member

The Hon'ble Mr. N. Dharmadan, Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
4. To be circulated to all Benches of the Tribunal?

JUDGEMENT

HON'BLE SHRI N. V. KRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

This is an application for compassionate appointment of the applicant which has been rejected by Annexure-I by the respondents without stating any reasons. Hence the applicant has filed this application seeking to quash the impugned Annexure-I order and to make a declaration that he is entitled to compassionate appointment.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents has submitted a statement opposing the admission.

3. We have also heard the counsel. The counsel for the applicant himself admits that when the applicant's father was medically incapacitated in June, 1976, he had made an application for compassionate appointment for his eldest son and later on, he himself passed away sometime in April, 1977. It is submitted that ^{of} his four sons, all the three sons who are elder to the applicant, have secured employment elsewhere. The applicant states that he is without a job and he is also taking care of his widowed mother.

4. We note that compassionate appointment is given to relieve the distress faced by the family either on ~~the~~ premature compulsory retirement on medical grounds or on the death of a Government servant in harness. As three of the applicant's elder brothers are already employed, it cannot be seriously contended that there is still indigence in the family. We are therefore of the view that a prima facie case for admission has not been made out and hence, this application is dismissed in limine.



1. 10. '90

(N. Dharmadan)
Judicial Member



1. 10. '90

(N. V. Krishnan)
Administrative Member

kmn

1. 10. '90