

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**OA/310/01088/2018**

**Dated Monday the 13<sup>th</sup> day of August Two Thousand Eighteen**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)**

Mr. K. Arjun,  
S/o. R. Kirupanandam,  
No. 4, Bharathi Street,  
Anna Nagar,  
Periyakuppam, Tiruvallur 602001. ....Applicant

By Advocate M/s. A. Prabakar

Vs

1.Union of India,  
rep by Secretary to Government,  
Indian Air Force, Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi.

2.The Deputy Director,  
Air Head Quarters,  
Vayu Bhawan,  
New Delhi 110106.

3.The Air Officer Commanding,  
No. 23, Equipment Depots,  
Air Force Station,  
Avadi, Chennai 55. ....Respondents

By Advocate Mr. Su. Srinivasan

**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 set aside the impugned proceedings of the second respondent dated 17.11.2017 bearing Proceedings Air HQ/23039/293/2016-17/PL-5 and seeking for a direction to the respondents to consider the name of the applicant for compassionate appointment. "

2. It is submitted that the applicant is aggrieved that Annexure A16 impugned order dt. 17.11.2017 rejecting his request for compassionate appointment in level 2 of pay matrix following the death of his father on 29.06.2011. The authorities awarded only 51 merit points to the applicant as against 62 points awarded to the last selected candidate. A break-up of merit points has also been provided to the applicant in the annexure to the impugned communication.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that while the applicant would not dispute the merit points awarded to him under different criteria, no information is provided about the merit points awarded to the selected candidates to enable the applicant to satisfy himself that the points were awarded correctly to them. Accordingly, the respondents are liable to provide complete information to the applicant in the absence of which the impugned order could not be sustained, it is contended.

4. Mr. Su. Srinivasan, senior Central Government standing counsel takes notice for the respondents.

5. I have considered the matter. The applicant is not disputing the merit points awarded to him. However, since it is submitted that the applicant suspected that selected candidates might have been awarded exaggerated merit points with a view to defeating the claim of the applicant, it is for the applicant to seek the relevant information under the Right To Information Act so as to satisfy himself. This Tribunal has no role in the matter at this stage as prima facie, no case is made out against the validity of the impugned order.

6. OA is dismissed. No costs.

**(R. Ramanujam)**  
**Member(A)**  
**13.08.2018**

SKSI