

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD**

**OA/20/1060/2013**

**Dated:29/04/2019**

**BETWEEN:**

1. Smt. G. Govindamma,  
W/o.G. Bikshalu,  
(Ex.SPM, Kavali, Cutchery S.O),  
Aged about 52 years,  
R/o. Azeerpuram Village,  
Kothayesuvaripalli B.O.  
Sankavaram S.O. Kannigiri H.O.  
Nellore Postal Division, Nellore.
2. G. Surendra Kumar,  
S/o. Late G. Bikshalu,  
(Ex. SPM Kavali Cutchery S.O.)  
Aged about 30 years,  
Azeerpuram Village,  
Kothayesuvaripalli B.O.  
Sankavaram S.O. Kannigiri H.O.  
Nellore Postal Division, Nellore.

..... Applicants

**AND**

1. The Superintendent of Post Office,  
Nellore Division, Nellore-524 001.
2. The Post Master General,  
Vijayawada Region,  
Vijayawada – 520 010.
3. The Chief Post Master General, A.P. Circle,  
Hyderabad – 500 001.
4. The Director General, Department of Posts,  
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi – 110 001.
5. Union of India rep.by  
The Secretary to the Department of Posts,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

..... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao, Advocate  
Counsel for the Respondents : Mrs. K.Rajitha, Sr. CGSC.

**CORAM**

**Hon'ble Mrs. Naini Jayaseelan, Admn. Member**

**ORAL ORDER**  
**{ Hon'ble Mrs. Naini Jayaseelan, Admn. Member }**

Heard Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Laxman representing Mrs. K. Rajitha, learned Sr. Central Government Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

2. The case of the applicant seeking the following relief:-

“It is therefore prayed that this Tribunal may be pleased to call for the records relating to Ir.No.B1/20/Relax/General, dated 4.2.2010 issued by; the first respondent on the basis of Lr.No.ST-31/CA/VP/2009, dated 2.2.2010 issued by the second respondent(not communicated to the applicants) and to the impugned inaction of the respondents on representations dated 28.1.2011 and 11.12.2011 to the third and fourth respondents and declare them as illegal, unjust, arbitrary, violative of Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution and also unsustainable and consequently be pleased to hold that the second applicant is entitled for compassionate appointment with consequential benefits and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

3. The case of the applicant for compassionate appointment was examined by the Circle Relaxation Committee (CRC) held on 11.01.2010

and the CRC did not recommended the case of the 2<sup>nd</sup> applicant on the ground:-.

“the committee could not select you as you did not merit the selection in the comparative study of the indigent circumstances of the family placed before the CRC and due to limited number of 5% of the total direct recruitment vacancies.”

3. However, subsequently, the applicant has filed the present OA to reconsider the case of the 2<sup>nd</sup> applicant. The applicant has filed two representations Annexure II, Annexure-III dated 11.12.2011 and 28.01.2011. It is the case of the applicant that both the representations has not been disposed of.

4. Without going into the merits of the case, the OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to dispose of both the representations dated 11.12.2011 and 28.01.2011 and pass appropriate orders as per extant policy within a period of eight weeks. The decision may be duly communicated to the applicant. No order as to costs.

**(NAINI JAYASEELAN)**  
**ADMN. MEMBER**

al