

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
LUCKNOW BENCH,  
LUCKNOW.**

**Original Application No. 132 of 2019**

This the 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2019

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

1. Anees Bano, aged about 20 years, D/o late Battoo.
2. Ruhi Bano, aged about 16 years, daughter of late Battoo through its Guardian her real elder sister namely Anees Bano  
Both Resident of House No. Type 1/127 P & T Colony, Sector K, Aliganj, Post Nirala Nagar, Police Station Aliganj, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate : Sri Mohd. Azam Beg.

Versus.

1. Chief General Manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL), U.P. East Lucknow.
2. Principal General Manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, BSNL Telecom Department, Gandhi Bhawan, Lucknow.
3. The Controller of Communication Accountant U.P. (E) Telephone Exchange Building, Vikas Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow.
4. The Accountant (Payment & Retirement) department of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Gandhi Bhawan, Lucknow.
5. Lucknow Telecom District Officer, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited AE Trunk Kaiserbagh, Lucknow.
6. Senior Sub Divisional Engineer (Material Management) Head Office, Gandhi Bhawan, Lucknow.
7. Sub Divisional Engineer (Phones), Ganga Sechayee Puram, Lucknow.
8. Executive Engineer (Phones) Vigilance Department of Bharat Sanchar Ltd. Gandhi Bhawan, Lucknow.

Respondents.

By Advocate : Sri G.S. Sikarwar for R-1, R-2 and R-4 to 8 and Ms. Prayagmati Gupta for R-3

**ORDER**

Heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the pleadings available on record.

2. It is contended by the learned counsel for the applicants that the father of the applicants, herein, who was working with the respondents on the post of regular Safaiwala, died in harness on 5.2.2015 while in service. After the death of father of the applicants, herein, the mother of the applicants moved a representation to the respondents praying inter-

alia compassionate appointment in favour of her daughter and also pensionary benefits including Gratuity etc. Learned Counsel for the applicants drew my attention at page nos. 45-50 wherein it is seen that after the death of applicants' father, PPO was issued in the name of the applicants' mother, but unfortunately the mother of the applicants has also passed-away on 4.7.2016. Learned counsel for the applicants states that the applicants, herein, are unmarried daughters and were solely dependents on the deceased employee. Hence, in the wake of death of mother of the applicants, the applicant no.1 preferred a representation to the respondents on 17.10.2016 for grant of pension/pensionary benefits and also compassionate appointment in favour of applicant no.2. Thereafter the applicant no.2 preferred a representation to the respondents on 23.3.2017 for grant of compassionate appointment in her favour. Since the applicant no.2 is minor, as per her own admission made in the O.A., no direction can be given to consider her case for grant of compassionate appointment. At this stage, learned counsel for the applicants states that liberty may be given to the applicants to prefer a comprehensive representation to the respondent no.1 and 3 (competent authority), which may be considered and decided by the respondent 1 and 3 (competent authority) within a time bound manner in accordance with law.

3. Without going into the merits of this case, this O.A. is finally disposed of finally at admission stage itself with a direction to the applicant no.1 to prefer a fresh representation to the respondent nos. 1 and 3 (competent authority) within 15 days from today, which shall be considered and disposed of by the respondent no.1 and 3 (competent authority) within a period of two months thereafter by passing a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law under intimation to the applicant. No costs.

**(Ms. Jasmine Ahmed)**  
Member-J

Girish/-