

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.545/07

Friday this the 8th day of February 2008

C O R A M :

HON'BLE Mrs.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

1. Smt.K.K.Santha,
W/o.late P.I.Ramakrishnan,
Peringottukarakaran House,
P.O.Mattathur, Avittapilly, Thrissur District.
2. P.R.Deepa,
D/o.late P.I.Ramakrishnan,
Peringottukarakaran House,
P.O.Mattathur, Avittapilly, Thrissur District. ...Applicants

(By Advocate Mr.P.K.Madhusoodhanan)

Versus

1. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
Divisional Office, Personnel Branch,
Southern Railway, Palghat.
2. Union of India
represented through the General Manager,
Southern Railway, Park Town, Chennai – 3. ...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil)

This application having been heard on 8th February 2008 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :-

ORDER

HON'BLE Mrs.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

The first applicant is the widow and the second applicant is the daughter of late P.I.Ramakrishnan who died in harness while working as Mail Guard, Shonur Railway Station, Palghat Division of the Southern Railway. The employee had expired on 18.7.1999. The applicants contend that they are all residing together and they have no other means of livelihood. The first applicant is suffering from acute Rheumatic Arthritis and is in pathetic circumstances. The request of the second applicant for



.2.

compassionate appointment had been rejected by Annexure A-1 dated 10.9.2002 which was made after due enquiries. The second applicant is a married daughter and in accordance with the rules she is not eligible unless it is proved that she is the sole bread winner of the family. In fact that is the contention taken by the respondents also that as per Annexure R-1 Railway Board's letter dated 3.2.1981, married daughters can be considered for compassionate ground appointment only if the General Manager is satisfied that she will act as the bread winner of the family.

2. The application is first of all highly belated. It is also admitted that the first applicant is a retired teacher and is receiving pension in that capacity and family pension. Hence there is no element of dependency of the widowed mother on the married daughter as far as financial situation is concerned. Subsequent representation of the applicants had also been rejected by Annexure A-2 order dated 24.10.2002 giving these reasons.

3. In the light of these facts position on record, I am of the view that there is no merit in the prayer of the applicants. The O.A is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Dated this the 8th day of February 2008)


SATHI NAIR
VICE CHAIRMAN

asp