

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench**

OA 310/01649/2019

Dated Thursday the 2nd day of January Two Thousand Twenty

P R E S E N T

**Hon'ble Shri. P. Madhavan, Member (J)
&
Hon'ble Shri. T. Jacob, Member (A)**

K.Jayalakshmi
W/o A.Suresh Kumar,
No.3, 3rd Floor, Narasimmalu Naidu Street,
Gandhi Market, Trichy – 620 008.

...Applicant

(By Advocate M/s T.Banumathy)

Vs

1. The Union of India,
Rep by the Chief Postmaster General,
Tamil Nadu Circle,
Chennai 600 002.

2. The Postmaster General,
Central Region,
Thiruchirapalli – 1.

3. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Thiruchirapalli Division,
Thiruchirapalli -1.

....Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.S.Nagarajan R1 to R3)

ORAL ORDER

Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. P. Madhavan, Member(J)

The applicant has filed this OA under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

“i.To call for all the relevant records pertaining to the Impugned Order No. B3/258, dated at Thiruchirapalli 620001 on 25-10-2018 and set aside the same.

ii. Further direct the respondents to consider the applicant's representations dated 13-02-2018, 23-10-2018 and 20-11-2019 and post the applicant as Branch Postmaster in any of the vacancies available in the Central Region, Thiruchirapalli, with continuity of service and to grant all consequential service and monetary benefits; and

iii. To grant such other order or orders deems fit and proper and thus render justice".”

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was offered provisional engagement as GDS Branch Postmaster against the vacancy created by the service termination of one A. Kannan and if ever it was decided to take him back into engagement the applicant's engagement would be terminated without notice.

3. After rendering 3 years of service, without any notice or enquiry the applicant's service was suddenly terminated on 11.01.2018 on the ground that the said A. Kannan has joined back after he had won the case against the department. Aggrieved by this the applicant made representation to the respondents to reconsider their decision and put her back into service with continuity of service.

But the respondents rejected the request of the applicant without giving any reasons for rejection by passing impugned order dated 25.10.2018.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the applicant has given another representation produced as Annexure AXI dt. 20.11.2019 and submits that the respondents are ready to dispose of the representation by passing a speaking order.

5. It is seen that the impugned order passed by the respondents is cryptic and non speaking order. Hence we feel that the applicant is entitled to get her representation properly considered and disposed of by passing a reasoned and speaking order.

6. In view of the above and without going into the substantive merits of the case, the competent authority is directed to consider Annexure AXI representation of the applicant dated 20.11.2019 in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

7. OA is disposed of at the admission stage.

(T. Jacob)
Member(A)
AS

02.01.2020

(P. Madhavan)
Member (J)