

3

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH
LUCKNOW**

Original Application NO: 13/2008.

This, the 4th day of March 2008.

HON'BLE MR. M. KANTHAIAH, MEMBER (J)

Ashok Kumar Verma, aged about 28 years, son of Late Sri Satguru Prasad Verma, resident of 592 D/35, Rajiv Nagar, Kharika, Telibagh, Lucknow.

Applicant.

By Advocate: Sri A. Asthana for Sri Ravi Nath.

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Department of Posts, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master, Lucknow G.P.O, Department of Posts, Lucknow GPO, 226001.

Respondents.

By Advocate: Sri K.K. Shukla for Dr. Neelam Shukla.

Order

By Hon'ble Mr. M. Kanthaiah, Member (J):

The applicant has filed original application to quash the impugned rejection order dated 21.3.2007 (Annexure 1) rejecting the claim of the applicant for his compassionate appointment and also further direction for consideration of his claim.

2. The respondents have filed counter affidavit denying the claim of the applicant stating that the rejection order is a reasoned order and as such there is no justified ground for interference of this Tribunal for quashing the same.

3. The applicant has filed rejoinder affidavit denying the stand taken by the respondents and also reiterating that the impugned rejection order is not at all a reasoned order.

4. Heard both sides.

5. The point for consideration is whether the applicant is entitled for the relief as prayed for.

6. The applicant challenged the impugned order covered under Annexure 1 stating that the same is not a reasoned order and thus rejection of his claim for compassionate appointment is not at all justified. Thus questioned the said impugned order. On perusal of the rejection order covered under Annexure -1 dated 21.3.2007, it clearly shows that the same is cyclostyle order and none of the details are furnished in respect of the non considering the claim of the applicant for his appointment on compassionate ground and also for allowing the claims of others to fill up the vacancies under that quota. Without furnishing any of such details, the respondent No. 2 has passed such cyclostyle order and as such, the same is liable to be quashed.

7. In the result, O.A. is allowed quashing the impugned rejection order Annexure A-1 dated 21.3.2007 stating that same is not a reasoned order and also directing the respondents authorities to reconsider the claim of the applicant for his compassionate appointment with a reasoned order as per rules within 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. No costs.


(M. Kanthaiah)

Member (J)

04-03-2008