

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A. NO. 194 OF 2013

Tuesday, this the 21st day of January, 2014

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Satheedevi K.R
W/o Late Rajendran P.R.Rajendran
Kizhakkedathu House, Temple Road
Cheranellore PO, Kochi – 682 034 ... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.P.A.Kumaran)

versus

1. Union of India represented by the Secretary
to Government of India
Ministry of Communications
New Delhi
2. Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited
represented by its Chairman and Managing Director
Sanchar Bhavan
New Delhi
3. Chief General Manager
Telecom, Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited
Kerela Circle, Trivandrum – 695 033
4. Principal General Manager Telecommunication
Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited
Ernakulam – 682 016
5. Assistant General Manager
Office of PGMT, Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited
Ernakulam – 682 016 ... Respondents


(By Advocate Mr.M.K.Aboobacker, ACGSC (R-1)
Advocate Mr.V.Santharam (R2-5))

The application having been heard on 21.01.2014, the Tribunal
on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER, JUDICIAL MEMBER


Applicant is the widow of late P.R.Rajendran who died in harness
on June 5, 2009 while working as Telecom Mechanic under Respondent



No.4. Applicant sought appointment on compassionate ground pursuant to the death of her husband. However, her request was turned down by the competent authority on the ground that the Committee constituted for the purpose had come to the conclusion that the family of the deceased employee was not "in extreme indigent condition." The committee held that the family of the deceased had obtained only 46 points as against the minimum eligibility requirement of 55 weightage points.

2. Applicant has assailed Annexure A-7 communication issued by Respondent No.4 intimating the decision of the Committee in this Original Application. Applicant has raised several contentions in support of her plea that the so called assessment is totally erroneous, arbitrary and illegal. Any how, when this case is taken up for consideration today, learned counsel submits that the Applicant will be satisfied if a direction is issued to Respondent No.3 to consider Annexure A-9 representation / appeal submitted by the applicant against Annexure A-7. In the peculiar facts and circumstance of the case, I am satisfied that the above prayer is only just and reasonable.


3. Therefore, the Original Application is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No.3 to consider and pass orders on Annexure A-9 appeal strictly on its merit and in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Needless to mention that applicant shall be afforded sufficient opportunity to be heard in person before any final decision is taken in the matter.



: 3 :

4. Original Application is **disposed of** in the above terms. No costs.

Dated, the 21st January, 2014


JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER
JUDICIAL MEMBER

VS