

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560 038.

Dated:- 29 APR 1994

APPLICATION NUMBER: 977 of 1993.

APPLICANTS:

Sri.A.Manjunatha
To.

RESPONDENTS:

v/s. The Chief General Manager, Karnataka
Telecom Circle, Bangalore & Other.

1. Sri.S.Prakash Shetty, Advocate, No.159, First Floor,
First Main Road, Seshadripuram, Bangalore-20.
2. The Chief General Manager, Karnataka Telecom Circle,
No.1, Old Madras Road, Ulsoor, Bangalore-8.
3. Sri.M.S.Padmaraajaiah, Central Govt.Stng.Counsel,
High Court Building, Bangalore-1.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the
Central administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/
STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/, passed by this Tribunal in the above
mentioned application(s) on 18th April, 1994.

Issued on
29/4/94

B.

gm*

o/c

for *[Signature]*
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES. 29/4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

O.A.NO:977/93

MONDAY THIS THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF APRIL 1994

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar ... Vice-Chairman

Shri V. Ramakrishnan ... Member [A]

A. Manjunatha,
Aged about 26 years,
Son of late Sri A. Annamalai,
Shankapura III Cross,
Chickmagalur-577 101.

... Applicant

[By Advocate Shri S. Prakash Shetty]

v.

1. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom,
Karnataka Circle,
Old Madras Road, Ulsoor,
Bangalore-8.
2. The Telecom District Engineer,
Chickmagalur.

... Respondents

[By Advocate Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah ...
Senior Central Government Standing Counsel]

ORDER

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:

1. We admit this application and dispose of the same finally. We regret that we are not in a position to assist the applicant who wants a job on compassionate grounds. It is true that he needs compassion because he lost his father who was the sole earning member in his family, an employee of the Telecom Department. But we find that the family has not been left in indigent circumstance because the family got more than a lakh of rupees by way of terminal benefits



and is also getting a family pension of about Rs.1200.

2. Admittedly out of the terminal benefits the applicant was paid Rs.10,000. It is common ground that the applicant still stays with the family and apparently he is being fed by his mother, the widow of the late employee. He is 25 years old and has failed in SSLC. We are told that he has no plans of taking the examination again and succeeding thereat. But Shri Prakash Shetty, the learned counsel for the applicant says that he has no information about it.

3. Be that as it may, as the rules for compassionate stand are totally derogatory to recruitment rules. Even so the rules say that if the family is found to be in totally indigent circumstance and is in dire need of assistance, compassionate appointment should be made. But otherwise there is no room for appointment on compassionate ground.

4. We think this is not a case in which it can be said that the family is in such dire circumstances as to call for extra succor by providing employment on compassionate grounds to a member of the family. The family having received over Rs.1 lakh and is also getting a family pension and the applicant himself having got Rs.10,000 out of the terminal benefits, he being about 25 years of age it is proper that he should find other means of livelihood than simply bickering for an appointment on compassionate grounds. The case of the applicant was considered by a High Powered Committee which turned down the request because

the applicant's family was getting a pension of Rs.1298 and had also received terminal benefits of more than Rs.1 lakh and therefore found no case for grant of an appointment to the applicant on compassionate ground. At this stage Shri Shetty for the applicant says that we should direct the respondents to reconsider the case of the applicant for compassionate appointment. That is a matter for the respondents and we cannot give any such direction and all that we do is reject the submission of Shri Shetty. However, we have no objection if the department can somehow accommodate the applicant in any post. But failure to do so will not serve as a lever for further applications on this score before this Tribunal for relief. No costs.

Sd-
MEMBER [A]

Sd-
VICE-CHAIRMAN



TRUE COPY
Sd- Chamber
SECTION OFFICER 29/4
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE