

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Madras Bench**

**MA/310/00682/2017 (in)(&) OA/310/01386/2017**

**Dated Monday the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of January Two Thousand Eighteen**

**P R E S E N T**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.Ramanujam, Member(A)**

A.Mohanraj,  
S/o B.Akilandan,  
No.50-A, Panikkan Street,  
Uraiyur 620003,  
Trichy District.

.. Applicant

By Advocate **Mr.P.Rajendran**

**Vs.**

1. The Union of India, rep by the  
Chief Post Master General,  
Tamil Nadu Circle, Chennai 600 002.
2. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
RMS T Division,  
Tiruchirapalli 620001.

.. Respondents

By Advocate **Mr.S.Nagarajan**

**ORAL ORDER**

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr.R.Ramanujam, Member(A)

The applicant has filed this OA seeking the following relief:-

“To call for the records relating to the impugned order of the second respondent in No.B2/100-B/RLXN/RRR dated 15.09.2015 and quash the same and direct the respondents to appoint the applicant on compassionate grounds in any suitable job commensurate with his qualification and grant him all consequential benefits.”

2. Heard. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was aggrieved by Annexure A3 impugned order dated 15.9.2015 by which his case for compassionate appointment had been rejected on the following grounds:-

“1. Non availability of Direct Recruitment Vacancy in the respective cadre under RRR quota.

2. Less indigent as per Relative Merit Points under RRR quota.”

It is submitted that similarly placed persons had been appointed in 2011-12 and it is not understood how the applicant has been assessed to be less indigent. Accordingly, the applicant would be satisfied, if the respondents are directed to provide details of the manner in which the assessment was carried out and the relative merit points awarded to the applicant under each of the criteria so that he could satisfy himself that his case had been considered fairly. It is further submitted that, after the said order dated 15.9.2015, the applicant is not aware of whether his case was placed before the CRC in the year 2016 and 2017 although it is stated in the said order that it would be placed before the next CRCs and examined on merit alongwith the fresh cases received. The respondents may,

therefore, be directed to inform the applicant also of the outcome of CRCs 2016 and 2017.

3. Keeping in view the limited prayer, and the fact that now there is no time limit to consider cases of compassionate appointment, the MA for condonation of delay of 308 days in filing the OA is allowed. Delay is condoned. The respondents are directed to disclose the manner in which the applicant's case was considered for the year 2015 and the relative merit points awarded on each of the criteria. The respondents shall also inform the applicant of the outcome of CRCs 2016 and 2017 in his case, alongwith similar details.

4. OA is disposed of with the above directions. No costs.

(R.Ramanujam)  
Member(A)

22.01.2018

/G/