

(61)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD.

O.A.NO. 1476 of 1994.

Between

Dated: 18.4.1995.

Smt. M. Parvathamma

...

Applicant

And

1. The Divisional Personal Officer, S.E.Railway, Khurda road,
2. The Divisional Railway Manager(P), S.E.Railway, Khurda Road
3. General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Reach, Calcutta
4. Ministry of Railways, rep. by its Secretary, (Union of India), New Delhi.

...

Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant

Sri. B.Gajendra Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents

Sri. N.R.Devaraj, SC for Rlys

CORAM:

..... : Administrative Member

Contd:...2/-

62

-2-

D.A.No. 1476/94.

Dt. of Decision : 18-04-95.

ORDER

(As per Hon'ble Shri A.B. Gorathi, Member (Admn.))

In this OA the request of the applicant Smt. M. Parvatemma is for giving appointment to her son M. Ganapati Rao on compassionate grounds.

2. The applicant's husband died on 31-03-1978 while working as a Fitter in Carriage & Wagon Shed, SE Railway, Palasa. At that time the applicant's son was aged 11 years only. She could not seek employment for herself on account of her poor eye-sight. The applicant approached the authorities in 1983 but her

appointment was turned down on the ground that she approached after a period of 5 years from the date of death of the employee. Thereafter the applicant continued to

The case of compassionate appointment for the applicant's son figured in some PNM meeting also. Finding no relief, the applicant approached a Member of the Parliament also for intervention. Despite these efforts by the applicant, there was no favourable response from the respondents.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties. Shri B. Gajendra Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant urged that at the time of the death of the employee the applicant's son was a minor and the delay on the part of the applicant in approaching the authorities concerned was more due to ignorance of the extant instructions. It is therefore pleaded that the ^{request} ~~case~~ of the applicant deserves to be considered on merits and not

rejected on the technical plea of delay.

4. Shri N.R. Devaraj, learned standing counsel for the respondents stated that besides the factor of delay, the case of the applicant would not merit consideration because the applicant's son/now 28 years and that the family managed till now without any employment assistance.

5. From the record placed before me it is apparent that the request of the applicant for giving compassionate appointment to her son was rejected on the ground of delay only. Keeping in view the circumstances of the case, I am of the considered view that the case requires to be examined ~~as soon as possible~~ and the same be decided as soon as possible. I request the respondents to consider the request of the applicant purely on merits and to take a decision within a period of

6. OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage

— (A.B. Gorathi)
Member (Admn.)

Dated : The 18th April 1995.
Dictated in Open Court

DY. *Dinesh*
Registar (J)

*C.C. Today
19/4/*

OA-1476/94

TYPED BY
CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.V.HARIDASAN: MEMBER(J)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI: MEMBER (J)

DATED 15/4/95

M.A. NO/R.P.NO./C.P.NO.

in

O.A. NO

1107/15

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

~~Dismissed as~~

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Rejected/Ordered.

no order as to costs.

YLKR

