

(15)

: IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL :

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

OA No.1084/93.

Dt. of Order:6-9-93.

Chebolu Venkaiah

....Applicant

Vs.

1. The General Manager,  
SC Railway, Secunderabad.

2. The Divisional Manager,  
SC Rlys, Vijayawada.

....Respondents

-- -- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri M.L.Ali

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri D.F.Paul, SC for Rlys

-- -- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE-CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI P.T.THIRUVENGADAM : MEMBER (A)

(Order of the Divn. Bench passed by Hon'ble  
Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member (A) ).

-- -- -- --

The applicant has filed this O.A. for a direction  
to the Respondents to consider his case for appointment  
on compassionate grounds on humanitarian grounds taking  
into consideration the family conditions and other cir-  
cumstances in the light of the resolutions passed by the

....2.

*Handwritten signature/initials*

16

. 2 .

Railway Board from time to time.

2. It is the case of the applicant that his father was working as Permanent Kalasi by the time of his death in 1970. At that time the applicant was minor, aged only one year. The applicant claims that he attained majority in 1987 and then he submitted an application for compassionate appointment on 12-11-90. Since no reply has been received from the Department this O.A. has been filed.

3. The applicant has referred to Railway Board communication No.E(NG)II/87/RC-1/5 dt.21-8-87 wherein guidelines for consideration of cases which are more than 10 years old for the purpose of compassionate appointment have been laid down. It has been said therein that wherever the General Manager is personally satisfied with the special features or circumstances to justify relaxation of time limit the case can be forwarded with his personal approval to the Railway Board for further consideration.

4. In view of the above guidelines we direct the Respondent No.1 to consider the case of the applicant keeping in view Railway Board letter referred to as well as any further communications under subject within two months from the date of receipt of this order. If

.....3.

2  
Zinif

the General Manager comes to a conclusion that it is a fit case for recommendation, he may forward the same to Railway Board for further action. The Original Application is ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

*P. J. Thi*  
(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)  
Member (A)

*V. Neeladri Rao*  
(V. NEELADRI RAO)  
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 6th September, 1993.  
Dictated In Open Court.

*A. S. J. 9/9/93*  
Deputy Registrar (J)

avl/

To

1. The General Manager, S.C.Rly, Secunderabad.
2. The Divisional Manager, S.C.Rlys, vijayawada.
3. One copy to Mr.M.L.Ali, Advocate, 3-6-780/7/H, Hamayatnagar, Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr.D.Francis Paul, SC for Rlys CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm

*3002 dmp*  
*pr @ 7.16.93*

TYPED BY

COMPALED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO  
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTHY : MEMBER (A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY  
MEMBER (JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. P. T. TIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated: 6-9 -1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

O.A.No. 1084/93 in  
T.A.No. (W.P. )

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

(7)

