

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: HYDERABAD**



Original Application No.20/1003/2019

Date of Order: 15.11.2019

Between:

1. P. Hymavathi, W/o. late Shri P.V.V. Ramana Rao,
Ex-GDS/MD, Aged about 51 years,
R/o. Tekula bora, Chuchirevulagudem BO,
a/w. Kunavaram SO, East Godavari District,
Andhra Pradesh – 507 121.
2. Padam Durga Prasad, S/o. late Shri P.V.V. Ramana Rao,
Ex-GDS/MD, Aged about 32 years,
R/o. Tekula bora, Chuchirevulagudem BO,
a/w. Kunavaram SO, East Godavari District,
Andhra Pradesh – 507 121.

...Applicants

AND

1. Union of India, Rep by its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications & Information Technology,
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
Andhra Pradesh Circle, Vijayawada.
3. Postmaster General, Andhra Pradesh Circle,
Visakhapatnam Region, Andhra Pradesh.
4. The Superintendent of Post Office,
Rajamandry Division, Rajamandry – 533 101,
East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.
5. Superintendent of Post Offices,
Khammam Division,
Khammam – 507 003, Telangana State.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicants ... Mr. G. Jaya Prakash Babu

Counsel for the Respondents ... Smt. M. Swarna, Advocate for
Mr. B. Rajeswara Rao,
Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)



ORAL ORDER
{As per B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}

2. The OA is filed challenging the rejection of the request made for compassionate appointment.

3. Brief facts are that the 2nd applicant applied for compassionate appointment as per the directions of the respondents vide letter dated 20.1.2015 consequent to the death of his father on 13.6.2010 while working for the respondents as Grameen Dak Sewak Mail Delivery agent. Thereafter, respondents directed him to submit further documents as per letters dated 12.2.2015 and 18.2.2015 which was complied with. After submission of such documents, respondents issued the impugned order dated 21.6.2017 stating that the case of the applicant has been rejected by the CRC held on 10.5.2012. 2nd Applicant made a representation on 19.8.2019 and the same has not been considered by the respondents. Aggrieved, OA has been filed.

4. The contentions of the applicants are that the processing of compassionate appointments should not be delayed as per the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. As per DOPT memo dated 16.1.2013 there is no time limit to consider cases of compassionate appointment. The 2nd applicant has worked as a paid substitute from 2010 to 2017.

5. Heard both the counsel and perused the pleadings.



6. At the outset, it is surprising that the respondents sought for documents from the applicant in 2015 though the issue of compassionate appointment was decided in 2012. Applicants claim that the said order of rejection of request for compassionate appointment was not communicated to them. If it was communicated, the question of submission of further documents in 2015 as sought by the respondents would not have arisen. Ld. Counsel for the applicants has prayed that the representation made on 19.8.2019 may be directed to be disposed of. Ld. counsel for the respondents has sought time for submission of the reply statement.

7. However, in order not to procrastinate the issue and in the interest of justice, keeping in view the facts stated in the OA and those in the representation referred to, respondents are directed to dispose of the representation of the 2nd applicant as per the extant rules, by issuing a speaking and well reasoned order in a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of this order.

With the above directions, the OA is disposed of, at the admission stage. There shall be no order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Dated, the 15th day of November, 2019

evr