

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

O.A. No.60/1541/2017

...
Date of decision: 08.01.2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).

...
...

Kashish Puri son of Sh. R.K. Puri, aged 23 years, Resident of House No.228-A, Sector 30-A, Chandigarh. Group 'C'.

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Telecommunications & Information Technology, Department of Posts, New Delhi.
2. Chief Postmaster General, Punjab Circle, Department of Posts, Sandesh Bhawan, Sector 17E, Chandigarh-160017.
3. Assistant Post Master General (Staff), Punjab Circle, Sector-17, Chandigarh.

...RESPONDENTS

PRESENT: Sh. Rohit Sharma, counsel for the applicant.

ORDER

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Heard.
2. Present O.A. has been filed wherein applicant seeks direction from this Tribunal to direct the respondents to reconsider his case for appointment on compassionate grounds in terms of orders of this Court in the case of **Hitesh Kumar Yadav Vs. Union of India** in O.A. No.060/00445/2015 decided on 06.09.2016 and **Jagdeep Singh vs. Union of India** in O.A. No.060/00728/2015 decided on 26.02.2016.
3. Sh. Rohit Sharma submitted that after demise of his mother in the year 2013, the applicant submitted representation for appointment on compassionate grounds. His case was considered by the Circle Relaxation Committee meeting but he was not offered appointment as he secured 56 marks which was less than the marks secured by

the last selected candidate. Two candidates namely Hitesh Kumar Yadav and Jagdeep Singh were also denied appointment as they also secured less marks viz. 52 and 45 respectively. They approached this Tribunal by filing OAs, which were disposed of with a direction to the respondents to reconsider their cases for appointment on compassionate grounds in the light of observations made therein. Thereafter, applicant also requested respondents to reconsider his case as they are considering the cases of aforesaid individuals whose cases were earlier considered and rejected along with him. To this effect, he has also submitted representation, but without having considering his case, the cases of above named individuals were considered. When applicant sought information under RTI Act, they informed that since there were directions by the Court to reconsider their cases whereas no such direction was in his case, therefore, they did not consider his case. Therefore, applicant is simply seeking issuance of direction to the respondents to reconsider his case as has been done in the case of Hitesh Kumar Yadav and Jagdeep Singh. Likewise a statement was made by learned counsel for the applicant to this effect at the Bar.

4. Issue notice to the respondents.
5. Sh. Ram Lal Gupta, Sr. Standing Counsel for Union of India, who is in receipt of advance copy submitted that though he has no objection to the prayer of the applicant, but he submitted that respondents may have reconsidered the case of the applicant along with above named two individuals and if they have already decided, then they will communicate the outcome of the same to the applicant, otherwise they will consider according to law.
6. Considering above, I dispose of this O.A. with a direction to the respondents to reconsider the case of the applicant as has been

done in the case of Hitesh Kumar Yadav and Jagdeep Singh, if already not considered. If they have already considered then order be communicated to the applicant, otherwise they will consider his case in the next Circle Relaxation Committee meeting for this purpose in accordance with policy.

7. Disposal of the O.A. in the above terms will not be construed as an opinion on the merit of this case.

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Date: 08.01.2018.
Place: Chandigarh.

`KR`

