

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MADRAS BENCH**

Dated the 29<sup>th</sup> day of November Two Thousand And Nineteen

**PRESENT:**

THE HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, MEMBER(J)  
THE HON'BLE MR. T. JACOB, MEMBER(A)

O.A.310/1119/2016

P. Balasubramanian,  
S/o. R. Perachi,  
Aged 48 years,  
D.No.89, P&T Colony,  
Mannar Puram,  
Tiruchirapalli- 620 020.

....Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. S. Ramaswamyrajarajan)

Vs.

Union of India

1. The Chief Postmaster General,  
Tamilnadu Circle,  
Chennai-600 002;
2. The Postmaster General,  
Central Region TN),  
Tiruchirapalli-620 001;
3. The Senior Manager,  
Mail Motor Service,  
Chennai-600 006;
4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Mail Motor Service,  
Tiruchirapalli-620 001.

....Respondents.

(By Advocate: Mr. G. Dhamodaran)

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

The OA is filed by the applicant seeking the following reliefs:-

"to quash the impugned order No. STA/37-109/09 Gr I, dated 30.05.2016 passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and to direct the respondents to restore the promotion given to the cadre of Grade.II driver vide order No. STA/15-10/2007/TR dated 27.01.2012 and promotion given to the Grade II driver vide order No. STA/15-10/2007/TR dated 01.07.2013 and

ii) to pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case with cost."

2. When the matter came up for consideration, Learned Counsel for the applicant produces a copy of the earlier judgment passed by the Tribunal in O.A 1120/2016 dated 26.09.2018 and drawn our attention to para-8 of the said decision and states that applicants wishes to have a similar direction in para -8 of the judgment, which is extract as under:-

" 8. .... At this stage, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant may be granted liberty to submit a representation for financial upgradation under MACP as seniority is not a bar for granting upgradation under the MACP scheme which is based on the number of years of service rendered. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that it is always open to an employee to make a representation regarding his grievance and no liberty need to be specifically granted in this regard by the Court."



3. He further submits his client would be satisfied if the applicant is permitted to make a fresh representation regarding his grievance with supported material, which may be directed to be disposed of by the competent authority within a stipulated period by a reasoned order.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents have no objection to the above prayer.

5. In view of the limited relief sought, we are of the view that OA could be disposed of with a direction to the applicant to make fresh representation regarding his grievance by citing the relevant material within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order and the same could be disposed of by the competent authority within a period of three months from the date of receipt of said representation by passing a reasoned and speaking order.

6. With the above direction, OA is disposed of accordingly without touching the merits of the case. No costs.