

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

---

**ORDERS OF THE BENCH**

---

**Date of Order: 13.03.2012**

**OA No. 138/2012**

Mr. Prakash Sharma, proxy counsel for  
Mr. D.P. Sharma, counsel for applicant.

Heard. O.A. is disposed of by a separate order on the  
separate sheets for the reasons recorded therein.

  
(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)  
MEMBER (J)

Kumawat

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 138/2012**

DATE OF ORDER: 13.03.2012

**CORAM**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Vinod Kumar Verma S/o Smt. Beena Devi W/o Shri Dal Chand, aged about 27 years, R/o Plot No. 37, Jain Colony, Sanjay Nagar-C, Jhotwara, Jaipur – Aspirant for the compassionate appointment on suitable post.

...Applicant

Mr. Prakash Sharma, proxy counsel for  
Mr. D.P. Sharma, counsel for applicant.

**VERSUS**

1. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Headquarter, New Delhi through the Managing Director.
2. The Chief General Manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Rajasthan Circle, Sardar Patel Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302008.
3. The Welfare Officer, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Rajasthan Circle Office, Jaipur.
4. The Sub Division Engineer Staff-III, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. Office of the Principal General Manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Telecommunication District Jaipur – 302010.

...Respondents

**ORDER (ORAL)**

The present Original Application has been preferred by the applicant praying therein that the respondents may kindly be directed to provide him appointment on any suitable post on compassionate grounds.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the applicant had already submitted a notice for demand of Justice dated 31.12.2011 (Annex. A/4) through his counsel before the respondents for providing appointment to the applicant on compassionate grounds, and the office of the respondent no. 2 informed the counsel for the applicant vide letter dated 06.01.2012 (Annex.



A/1) that the matter of the applicant has been sent to Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Headquarters, New Delhi, for final decision.

3. The applicant has again submitted a registered legal notice dated 13.01.2012 (Annex. A/5) through his counsel to the respondents submitting that the reply given by the respondents through letter dated 06.01.2012 (Annex. A/1) is incomplete and unsatisfactory, and from perusal of the reply it is not clear that to whom and when the matter was sent to the BSNL, Headquarters, New Delhi, and after that what action was taken for finalization of the matter and when reminders were sent for the purpose. So it was requested to provide all the copies of the communications made between them.

4. Upon careful perusal of the pleadings as well as documents, it is evident that although the notice for demand of justice dated 31.12.2011 (Annex. A/4) has been decided by the respondents vide letter dated 06.01.2012 (Annex. A/1) simply submitting that the case of the applicant has been sent to the BSNL, Headquarters, New Delhi for final decision, but has not given any details regarding to whom and when the matter was sent to the BSNL, Headquarters, New Delhi and after that what steps has been taken by them. Further, the registered legal notice dated 13.01.2012 (Annex. A/5) is still pending consideration before the respondents, which is also not disputed by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant.

5. Having considered the aspect that the registered legal notice dated 13.01.2012 (Annexure A/5) is still pending consideration before the respondents, and also the notice for




demand of justice dated 31.12.2011 (Annex. A/4) has not been decided by passing a reasoned and speaking order, I deem it just and proper that the ends of justice would be met if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the notice for demand of justice dated 31.12.2011 (Annex. A/4) and also the registered legal notice dated 13.01.2012 by passing a reasoned and speaking order.

6. Consequently, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the notice for demand of justice dated 31.12.2011 (Annex. A/4) and also the registered legal notice dated 13.01.2012 (Annex. A/5) by passing a reasoned and speaking order and communicate the decision so taken to the applicant expeditiously but in any case not later than a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. If any prejudicial order against the interest of the applicant is passed by the respondents, the applicant will be at liberty to challenge the same by way of filing the substantive Original Application.

8. With these observations and directions, the Original Application stands disposed of with no order as to costs.

  
(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)  
MEMBER (J)