

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
LUCKNOW BENCH  
LUCKNOW**

**Original Application No. 332/00550/2018**

**This the 21<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2018**

**Hon'ble Ms. Jasmine Ahmed, Member - I**

Sunil Kumar Yadav, son of Late Ram Lal, R/o village Harai Khera, Hamlet of Amausi, District Lucknow.

..... Applicant

By Advocate: Sri Rajesh Kumar Pathak

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India, through Director, Ministry of Broad Casting, New Delhi.
2. Prashar Bharti through its Director, Lucknow.
3. Kendra Nideshak Aakash Vani, Lucknow.
4. Screening Committee through its Chairman, Lucknow

..... Respondents

By Advocate: Sri Rajesh Katiyar

**ORDER (ORAL)**

It is the contention of the Learned Counsel for the Applicant that the father of the applicant expired on 15.04.2005 and thereafter on 03.06.2005 a representation was given by the applicant for compassionate appointment. It is also contended that till date no compassionate appointment has been granted to the applicant and in between ten persons have been given compassionate appointment by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant further states that the respondents have come out with a letter dated 13 Sep 2018 wherein it has been stated that the case of the applicant was considered in the meetings held on 26.05.2006, 18.11.2011 and 05.08.2016 but his case was not found fit in the comparative merit chart and accordingly he was not granted compassionate appointment but his case will be considered again in the next meeting. He further states that the respondents have never provided any comparative merit chart to the applicant so as to understand how the case of the applicant was compared vis-à-vis other similarly situated persons who were also in the queue of compassionate appointment.

3. Taking into account the arguments of the applicant's counsel, respondents are directed to provide all the documents in which the case of the applicant has been compared vis-à-vis other similarly situated persons and the marks allotted to him and the other persons within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that nothing has been commented on the merit of the case.

4. With the above observation and direction, the O.A stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Jasmine Ahmed)  
Member (J)

RK

