

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

D.A. No. 291/93.

Dt. of Decision : 16-8-94.

Mr. Godla Venkatamuni

.. Applicant.

vs

1. The Union of India, rep. by General Manager, SC Rly, Rail Nilayam, Sec'bad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer, SC Rly, Rail Nilayam, Sec'bad.
3. The Dy. Chief Mechanical Engineer, Carriage Repair Shop, SC Rly, Settipalli (PO), Tirupati.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. G.V. Subba Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN  
THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

42

O.A.NO.291/93.

JUDGMENT

Dt: 16.8.94

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN)

Heard Shri G.V.Subba Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri N.V.Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. Land measuring 0.578 Cents in Survey No.20/6 of Settipalle Village belonging to the applicant's mother was acquired for Railway Carriage Repair Shop, Tirupathi of South Central Railway. A scheme was envisaged whereby one member of the displaced family consequent on the acquisition is offered a post in the Railways. When the applicant applied for a post for his son, Shri G.Subrahmanyam, the same was denied on the ground that the acquired property does not belong to either the applicant or his son Subramanyam.

3. Such beneficial claims have to be considered liberally. When a family is deprived of their land for the purpose of acquisition, a post is offered to the member of that family to compensate them for the loss of the land, to some extent. It is just and proper for the Tribunal/Court to take cognizance of the fact that generally mothers in the rural areas live with their sons and in such case, old ladies will naturally spend income from the land to the other members of the family if it is

✓

To

1. The General Manager, S.C.Rly,  
Union of India, Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer, S.C.Rly,  
Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
3. The Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, Carriage Repair Shop,  
S.C.Rly, Settipalli (PO) Tirupathi
4. One copy to Mr.G.V.Subba Rao, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, ~~Asst~~ SC for Rlys. CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

16/10/1984  
1650

43

.. 3 ..

not thrown into 'hotchpot.' It had become necessary for the Government/Railways to come up with such beneficial schemes as it is felt that the member of the family will be deprived of an <sup>avocation</sup> ~~occasional~~ when the possession of the land was taken away. So, we feel that the said scheme is equally applicable to the ~~sons~~ son of a woman if the land of such woman is acquired by the Government/Railways.

4. It is not clear as to whether the applicant's ~~son's~~ name was already empanelled or not. But the fact remains that he was already called for interview in 1985.

Hence, if the applicant is found eligible for the post of Khalasi, the respondents are directed to give appointment to the applicant to the said post as and when his turn comes by treating it as ~~selection~~ the date of selection on which those who were called for interview <sup>were selected</sup> in 1985 and the name of the applicant should be treated as the last of that list. If those who were called for interview in 1985 were already appointed, the applicant should be given appointment in the next available vacancy in the post of Khalasi for direct recruits.

5. The OA is ordered accordingly. No costs.

R. RANGARAJAN  
MEMBER (ADMN.)

V. NEELADRI RAO  
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 16th August, 1994.  
Open court dictation.

vsn

Deputy

1884  
Registrar(C)

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.R.RANGARAJAN : M(ADAM)

DATE: 16 - 8 - 1994

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A.No./R.A/C.A.No.

O.A.No.  
(T.A.No.)

29193  
(W.P.NO)

Admitted and Interim directions  
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed

Dismissed for Default.

Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

Central Administrative Tribunal  
DESPATCH

25 AUG 1994

HYDERABAD BENCH

pvm