

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

\*\*\*

O.A.217/99.

Dt.of Decision : 16-02-99.

Chennam Srinivasa Rao

.. Applicant.

Vs

1. The Chairman,  
Central Water Commission,  
Min. of Water Resources,  
704, Seva Bhavan, R.K. Muram,  
New Delhi-66.

2. The Chief Engineer,  
Krishna & Godavari Basin,  
Central Water Commission,  
H.No.5-9-201/B&B1,  
Hyderabad-1.

3. The Executive Engineer,  
Central Water Commission,  
Lower Godavari Division,  
H.No.11-5-382 to 396,  
II Floor, Red Hills,  
Hyderabad-4.

4. The Superintending Engineer,  
Central Water Commission,  
Godavari Circle,  
H.No.11-5-382, Ist Floor,  
Red Hills, Hyderabad-4.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the applicant : Mr.B.Bhaskara Rao

Counsel for the respondents : Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao, Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (JUDL.)

*R*

..2/-

ORDER

Heard Mr.G.V.R.S.Vara Prasad for Mr.B.Bhaskara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant herein is the son of one Ch.Pitchaiah who was working as Khalasi in the respondent organisation <sup>and</sup> died on 5-2-95 while in service.

3. The applicant herein submitted a representation to the respondent authorities to consider his case for appointment on compassionate grounds.

4. The Superintending Engineer (Godavari) considering his case and rejected the case of the applicant. His order No.49/5/96/GC(Admn)/2054 dated 6-8-97 (Annexure-IV).

5. The ~~objective~~ of providing compassionate appointment is to provide <sup>immediate</sup> ~~minimum~~ financial assistance to the family which <sup>its</sup> ~~has~~ lost breadwinner. The respondent authorities should have considered in proper prospective the representation of the applicant. If they felt that the representation was lacking in any particulars they have should have sought necessary information from the applicant. The Superintending Engineer (Godavari) appears to have rejected the claim of the applicant on the ground that he has completed his studies and no other family members has to be supported. I feel the said ground may not be a sufficient ground <sup>to reject the claim and</sup> to sustain in a Court of law. The respondent authorities must consider the case of the applicant in accordance with the C.M.No.14014/6/94-Estt.(D), dated 30-06-87 and 9-10-98 and they must give specific reasons for not entertaining the application of the applicant for providing the appointment on compassionate ground on the death of his father.

*Je*

-3-

6. The respondents are hereby directed to consider afresh the case of the applicant for appointment on compassionate ground strictly as per rules within 2 ~~xxx~~ months from the date receipt of a copy of this order.

7. In case the respondents are to form an opinion that the family of the applicant is not in indigent circumstances they must give a detailed speaking order to the applicant.

8. With the above directions the OA is disposed of at the admission stage itself. No order as to costs.

(Registry should send a copy of this OA with enclosures along with this order to the respondents)



(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)  
MEMBER (JUDL.)

16. 2. 99.

Dated : The 16th Feb. 1999.  
(Dictated in the Open Court)



76-2 PP.

spr