

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA/310/00530/2018

Dated Tuesday the 24th day of April Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)

K.Janaki,
D/o. Late D. Kannan,
No. 1-A, East Street, Kolathur,
Chennai 600099.Applicant

By Advocate M/s. T.N.Sugesh

Vs

- 1.The Union of India,
rep by the Chief General Manager,
Southern Railway, Chennai 600003.
- 2.The Divisional Railway Manager,
Personnel Branch, Chennai Division,
Southern Railway, Chennai 600003.
- 3.The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
Chennai Division, Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai 600003.
- 4.K.Mohan,
S/o. Late D.Kannan,
No. 40, Murugesu Gramani Street,
Anbazhagan Nagar, Perambur,
Chennai 600011.Respondents

By Advocate Mr. P. Srinivasan

ORAL ORDER

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

Heard. The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

“To direct the respondents to consider and appoint the applicant on compassionate grounds in any suitable post commensurate with her qualifications and pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.”

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is aggrieved by Annexure A6 impugned order dt. 08.02.2018 by which her request for compassionate appointment had been rejected on the ground that a similar request had been made by her stepmother's son and also the fact that neither of the two families were in financial distress. It is submitted that the order is non-speaking in as much as it does not disclose the basis on which the respondents had arrived at such conclusion.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would, however, add that the applicant wished to obtain all relevant information regarding the manner in which her case was processed and the merit points awarded to her under various criteria to satisfy herself that her case had not been rejected unfairly. Accordingly, she would be satisfied if she is permitted to withdraw this OA with liberty to file a fresh OA in the event of her being aggrieved with the said order after obtaining all relevant information. He has made necessary endorsement in the OA

records accordingly.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would further submit that as per latest DoPT orders, there is no time limit for consideration of cases for compassionate appointment and cases once rejected could be considered again for the vacancies of the subsequent years. Accordingly the applicant would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to consider her case further for the subsequent years.

5. Mr. P. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents.

6. Keeping in view the limited prayer and that that applicant wishes to obtain relevant information before challenging the impugned order, the OA is permitted to be withdrawn. This will, however, be no bar to the applicant being considered on merits in the subsequent years after 2014 for various posts for which vacancies might be available under the quota for compassionate appointment.

7. OA is dismissed as withdrawn with the above observation.

(R. Ramanujam)
Member(A)
24.04.2018

SKSI