

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD**

OA/020/285/2017

Date of Order : 17.07.2018

Between:

Vedula Padmavathi,
W/o. Late Vedula Anand,
D/o. Subba Rao, aged 44 years,
D.No.24-12-4, Buddavarapu Street,
Weavers Colony, Rajahmundry,
East Godavari District, A.P.

..... Applicant

AND

1. Union of India rep. by its
Secretary,
M/o. Information and Broadcasting,
Doordarshan, Prasara Bharathi,
Government of India,
New Delhi.
2. The Directorate General,
Prasara Bharathi,
Broadcasting Corporation of India,
Doordarshan, Doordarshan Bhavan,
New Delhi.
3. The Addl. Director General (E) (SZ),
Prasara Bharathi, India's Public Service
Broadcaster,
All India Radio and Doordarshan,
Swamy Sivandana Salai,
Chennai.
4. The Deputy Director General (Engg),
Doordarshan Kendra,
Ramanthapur,
Hyderabad.

..... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. Raj Kumar Rudra
Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. I. Koti Reddy, SC for Doordarshan

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.KANTHA RAO, JUDL. MEMBER

ORAL ORDER

{ Per Hon'ble Mr.Justice R.Kantha Rao, Judl. Member }

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the Applicant. No representation for the Respondents. Reply is also not filed.

2. Shri Vedula Anand, who is the husband of the Applicant, expired on 25.7.2012 while working as Senior Technician in Doordarshan Kendra, Hyderabad, leaving behind him the Applicant, a daughter and mother. Immediately after the death of her husband, the Applicant made an application to the Respondents seeking compassionate appointment. In the year 2015, a letter was received from the Directorate of Doordarshan directing the Applicant to submit application along with all the requisite documents. However, the Compassionate Appointment Committee – for short C.A.C., by Memo dated 15.02.2016 informed the Applicant that her request for compassionate appointment was not considered by the C.A.C. as some details regarding the terminal benefits received by her were not furnished. It is also mentioned in the Memo that the application of the applicant will be included in the next C.A.C. But subsequently, the Applicant did not receive any information from the Respondents. On that she filed the present O.A. seeking a direction to the Respondents to consider her representation dated 17.10.2006 and to provide her compassionate appointment in any suitable post in the respondent department.

3. Having regard to the aforementioned facts, it is obvious that the Respondents did not reject the case of the Applicant for compassionate appointment and moreover by the Office Memorandum dated 15.02.2016 they stated that her application will be included for consideration in the next C.A.C. In view of the said Office Memorandum, the Respondents are, therefore, directed to consider the case of the Applicant for compassionate appointment in a suitable post and pass appropriate orders within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

4. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

(JUSTICE R. KANTHA RAO)
JUDL. MEMBER

pv