

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD (TELANGANA)
NO. 5-10-193, 1ST FLOOR, HACA BHAVAN, HYDERABAD - 500004

Order Sheet

Item no.: 6
O.A./104/2023 (ANDHRA PRADESH)
[COMPASSIONATE APPOINTMENT]
Court No.: 2

No of Adjournment: 22

Order Dated: 28/02/2025

RAJANA LAKSHMI
Vs
SOUTH CENTRAL RAILWAY

For Applicant(s) Advocate : B RAJESH KUMAR

For Respondent(s) Advocate : A VIJAYA BHASKAR BABU, K MANICKARAJ

Order of The Tribunal

Mr. B. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant appeared through video conferencing and advanced his arguments.

Mr. A. Vijaya Bhaskar Babu, learned Standing Counsel for the official respondents and Mr. K. Manickaraj, learned counsel for the private respondent appeared physically and advanced their arguments.

Learned counsel for the private respondent has pointed out that the applicant has avoided to reveal her age, while filing this O.A., even though she has mentioned the age of the Respondent No.4 as 45 years. His contention is that since the applicant has already reached the age of 63 years, even if she were otherwise eligible for appointment under compassionate grounds, she would have been disqualified merely on the ground of age. In this regard, he has furnished a copy of Deed dated 19.1.1973 in Telugu, along with its English translation, in support of his contention.

Learned counsel for the private respondent has also furnished a copy of the Registered Deed of Maintenance between Smt. Rajana Simhachalam and Shri Rajana Appanna (the deceased employee). Shri Rajana Appanna died on 5.3.1998, after which, his second wife Smt. Varahamma got compassionate appointment as Safaiwala on 9.6.1990. Later, Smt. Varahamma died on 28.01.2000. Hence, Respondent No.4, who is the daughter of Smt. Varahamma sought compassionate appointment on

10.01.2022.

The applicant has claimed compassionate appointment against the death of her father, which occurred on 5.3.1988. She is the daughter of the first wife of the deceased employee and by the time of his death, she has been married to another Railway employee, on whose death, she has already been receiving pension.

The entire complicated factual matrix has been brought out in para 6 at page 8 of the reply filed by the official respondents. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that he has already served a copy of the rejoinder on the official and the private respondents, which they confirmed, to have received through whatsapp. However, the same is not available on the file. Hence, the matter is adjourned.

Counsel for the 4th Respondent seeks and is permitted to file brief written arguments, within three weeks.

Counsel for the applicant is directed to clearly mention the age of the applicant in the O.A., on the date of filing of the O.A.

List the matter on 25.03.2025.

Varun Sindhu Kul Kaumudi
Member (A)

/pv/