

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.597/2001.

Friday this the 13th day of July 2001.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

1. Elizabeth,
W/o K.Ravindran,
Vazhavilakom Puthen Veedu,
Kanjirampara,
Thiruvananthapuram-30.
2. R.Suresh Kumar,
Vazhavilakom Puthen Veedu,
Kanjirampara,
Thiruvananthapuram-30.
3. R.Sunilkumar,
Vazhavilakom Puthen Veedu,
Kanjirampara,
Thiruvananthapuram-30. Applicants

(By Advocate Shri Vishnu S.Cempazhanthiyil)

Vs.

1. Senior Superintendent,
RMS 'TV' Division,
Thiruvananthapuram.
2. Circle Relaxation Committee, rep.
by its Chairman, Office of the
Chief Postmaster General,
Kerala Circle,
Thiruvananthapuram.
3. Chief Postmaster General,
Kerala Postal Circle,
Thiruvananthapuram.
4. Director General,
Postal Department, New Delhi.
5. Union of India, represented by
its Secretary, Ministry of
Communications, New Delhi. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri R.Prasanthakumar)

The application having been heard on 13th July 2001
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

m

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The first applicant is the wife and the applicants 2 and 3 are the children of Shri K.Ravindran who retired from service w.e.f. 1.3.97 on invalid pension after serving for 23 years. As the applicants are unemployed alleging that the family was thrown to extreme indigence on the retirement of the bread winner on invalid pension, Shri Ravindran made a representation for grant of employment assistance on compassionate grounds by appointing the 2nd applicant on a suitable post. The request was turned down by order dated 12.12.97 on the ground that, the Circle Relaxation Committee on examination of the relevant aspects came to the conclusion that the family was not in indigent circumstances warranting the department to provide a job to the 2nd applicant. The 2nd applicant made a further representation to the 4th respondent on 4.4.2001 (A3) and made another representation to the 5th respondent also on 2.5.2001 (A4). However, the impugned order (A5) was given to the 2nd applicant by the 1st respondent again turning down the applicant's claim. It is aggrieved by this, the applicants have jointly filed this application to call for the records and to quash A2 & A5, for a direction to the 5th respondent to consider and pass orders on A4 and for a direction to the 1st and 3rd respondents to consider the case of the 2nd applicant for engagement in the Post Offices and RMS Offices as Casual Mazdoor/substitute/ED Agent.

2. When the OA came up for hearing learned counsel on either side stated that the application may be disposed of

Am

directing the 5th respondent to consider the representation (A4) or to have the representation considered by the 4th respondent, taking into account the relevant facts which are made in the representation and to give the applicants an appropriate reply within a reasonable time.

3. In the light of the above submission made by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of directing the 5th respondent, either to consider the representation himself or to have the representation considered by the 4th respondent, keeping in view the income of the family, its liabilities, the state of health of the retired employee and such other relevant facts and to give the applicants an appropriate reply within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs .

Dated the 13th July 2001.



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

rv

List of Annexures referred to in the order:

- A-2: True copy of letter No.B/18/31 dated 12.12.1997 of the 1st respondent.
- A-3: True copy of the representation dated 4.4.2001 of 2nd applicant to the 4th respondent.
- A-4: True copy of the representation dated 2.5.2001 of 2nd applicant to the 5th respondent.
- A-5: True copy of letter No.B/18/31 dated 24.5.2001 of the 1st respondent.