

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench**

OA 310/01660/2018

Dated Wednesday the 19th day of December Two Thousand Eighteen

P R E S E N T

**Hon'ble Mr. R.Ramanujam, Member(A)
&
Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Member (J)**

K. Premjothi
No. 14, Selva Vinayagar Koil Street
Magazinpuram, Vyasarpadi
Chennai 600 039. .. Applicant

By Advocate M/s. Thenmozhi Shiva

Vs.

1. Union of India represented by
The Director General
The Director General of Lighthouse and Lightships
“Deep Bhavan”
A-13, Sector-24, Gautam Budh Nagar
Noida – 201 301.
2. Government of India
Ministry of Shipping
Directorate of Lighthouses and Lightships
Deep Bhavan, 5/20 Jaffar Syrang Street
Chennai 600 001. .. 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 call for records on the file of the 2nd respondent in No. MDS:Court Case (Premjothi) dated 27.04.2018 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to appoint the applicant for suitable vacant post in any of directorate on compassionate grounds since the applicant's father Mr. Kodhandapani, S/o. Elumalai aged about 52 years, while working as technician mate in the 2nd respondent office died on 26.04.2004 at about 4.00 pm while he was servicing.”

2. It is submitted that the applicant had applied for compassionate appointment for the year 2015 which was rejected by the respondents without stating any reasons. Accordingly, the applicant filed OA 236/2018 which was disposed of by this Tribunal by an order dated 22.02.2018 directing the respondents to inform the applicant of the reasons for rejection of his claim by a speaking order. It was also directed that the applicant shall be informed similarly about the fate of his claim for the year 2016-17. The impugned order dated 27.04.2018 has been issued by the respondents in pursuance thereof which, however, is again a non-speaking order.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the respondents were required to disclose the manner in which her case was considered, how she was assessed and how the assessment fell short of the cut off for selection in the

relevant year. The applicant was also entitled to be informed of the Relative Merit Points(RMP) awarded to him under various criteria so that he could satisfy himself that he had been correctly assessed. However, the impugned order is silent on all these and merely states that the matter was placed before the Placement committee which did not recommend the applicant's case.

4. Mr. Su. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents and submits that the respondents would have no objection to disclosing the details of the assessment to the applicant as above.

5. Keeping in view the submission, this OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to disclose all the relevant details to the applicant so as to satisfy him that his case was considered fairly and objectively in terms of RMPs and that the applicant fell short of the minimum cut off within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(P. Madhavan)
Member (J)

19.12.2018

(R. Ramanujam)
Member(A)

AS