

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.573/2004.

Friday this the 15th day of April, 2005.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. K.V.SACHIDANANDAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

<p>1. V.K.Chinnamma alias Chinna, W/o Late K.C.Kumaran, valiyaparambil House, Mulavukad P.O.-682504.</p>	<p>Applicants</p>
<p>2. Anil Kumar V.K., S/o Late K.Kumaran, Valiyaparambil House, Mulavukad P.O., 682504.</p>	<p>Applicants</p>

(By Advocate Shri K.Shri Rao)

Vs.

<p>1. Union of India represented by its Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi.</p>	<p>Respondents</p>
<p>2. The Director, Integrated Fisheries Project, P.B.No.1801, Kochi-16.</p>	<p>Respondents</p>

(By Advocate Shri Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil)

The application having been heard on 15.4.2005, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R (Oral)

HON'BLE MR.K.V.SACHIDANANDAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

The first applicant is the wife of late K.C.Kumaran and the second applicant is the son who was an employee of the respondent organisation. The applicants have made an application dated 20.1.2004 (A3) seeking employment assistance to the 2nd applicant on compassionate grounds. The respondents were rejected their claim on the ground that the applicants had not produced the Succession Certificate. Aggrieved by the



action on the part of the respondents the applicants have filed this O.A. seeking a direction to the respondents to give a suitable employment to the 2nd applicant on compassionate ground.

2. Shri K. Shri Hari Rao, learned counsel appeared for the applicants and Shri Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil, learned counsel appeared for the respondents. Learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the applicants have produced all the relevant documents including the Succession Certificate before the authorities. Learned counsel for the respondents in paragraph 6 of the reply statement has stated as follows:

"Thereafter the 2nd applicant submitted a copy of the above Succession Certificate dated 26.11.2002, along with a request dated 19.3.2003, praying for compassionate appointment in Integrated Fisheries Project. Since the 2nd applicant had not produced the documents like Annual Income Certificate along with the application, the 2nd applicant was directed to produce the same and the 2nd applicant produced the same in the 2nd respondent's office on 3.8.2004."

3. It appears that the applicant has produced all the documents. According to the respondents the case of the applicants will be considered in the next Screening Committee which will be convened soon for detailed examination in granting the relief to the applicants. On the basis of the above submissions and the pleadings I am of the view that there is no need for judicial intervention in the matter *as of now*.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants invited my attention to the Scheme referred to in Annexure R(b) (Page 14 of the reply statement). In paragraph 12 of the reply statement on the heading "Procedure" wherein it is stated that:

"The Committee may meet during the second week of every month to consider cases received during the previous month. The applicant may also be granted personal hearing by the Committee, if necessary, for better appreciation of the facts of the case."

Counsel for the applicants requests that an opportunity of personal hearing may be offered to the applicants.

5. As agreed to by the counsel for the parties, this Court directs the respondents to give an opportunity of personal hearing to the applicant, consider the applicants' case within a time frame and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible.
6. O.A. is disposed of as above. In the circumstance no order as to costs.

Dated the 15th April, 2005.



K.V.SACHIDANANDAN
JUDICIAL MEMBER