

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Madras Bench**

**OA 310/01503/2018**

**Dated Thursday the 6<sup>th</sup> day of December Two Thousand Eighteen**

**P R E S E N T**

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

G. Hemanath  
1B, 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Balaji Nagar  
Anakaputhur  
Chennai – 600 070.

.. Applicant

By Advocate **M/s. P.R. Sathyanarayanan**

**Vs.**

1. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director  
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited  
Corporate Office  
New Delhi.

2. The Chief General Manager  
Chennai Telephones  
89, Millers Road  
Chennai – 600 010.

.. Respondents

By Advocate **Mr. Ramesh Kumar**

## 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 call for the records relating to the proceedings in Lr. No. ASR/CGA/CHTD/1541/2016 dated 13.04.2018 issued by the second respondent and quash the same as illegal and to direct the respondents to give compassionate appointment to the applicant in any of the suitable post in the respondents' department and pass such further or other orders as this Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

2. It is submitted that the applicant was aggrieved by Annexure A6 order dated 13.04.2018 rejecting his claim for compassionate appointment following the death of his father on 12.08.2011. The impugned order is cryptic in as much as it states that the applicant's case was rejected by the Circle High Power Committee for the year 2016 as the family was “less indigent as per relative weightage points”. It is also stated that keeping in view of the Assets and Liabilities of the family of the deceased official, support arrangement, constitution of the family and overall condition of the family, the committee did not agree to recommend the case of the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that it is not clear from the impugned order how the Circle High Power Committee arrived at the conclusion

that on an overall assessment of the condition of the family, it did not deserve support in the form of compassionate appointment. Also, no details of the relative weightage points awarded to the applicant are available in the impugned order. Accordingly the applicant would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to consider the case of the applicant and pass a reasoned and speaking order duly disclosing all the relevant factors taken into account while arriving at the conclusion and the weightage points awarded against each of the criteria. In the event of the applicant still not being found deserving for the year 2016 in terms of the relative weightage points as per the scheme of compassionate appointment, he is entitled to be considered in the subsequent years and, therefore, the respondents may also be directed to inform the applicant of the outcome of any such consideration with the same details.

4. Keeping in view the limited relief sought and without going into the substantive merits of the case, the respondents are directed to disclose the norms as well as the actual weightage points awarded to the applicant under various criteria in the year 2016 as also the cut off points of the last selected candidate in the category of compassionate appointees. Further, if the respondents have already carried out a similar exercise for 2017 and 2018, the applicant may be informed if his case was considered and if not the reasons therefor. In case the applicant had

been considered again in 2017 and 2018 and was again found to have secured relative weightage point below cut off, similar details may be provided to the applicant in respect of these years also.

5. OA is disposed of with the above directions.

(R. Ramanujam)  
Member(A)  
**06.12.2018**

AS