

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH**

OA/310/00846/2014

Dated Wednesday the 24th day of February Two Thousand Sixteen

P R E S E N T

Hon'ble Mr.R.Ramanujam, Member(A)

S.Rengarajan
No.804, Thiruvalluvar Avenue,
No.1, Toll Gate,
Trichy 621216. .. Applicant

By Advocate M/s.Ratio Legis

Vs.

1. The Union of India, rep. by
The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai-3.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai-3.
3. The Chief Engineer,
Track Machines Unit,
Head Quarters,
Southern Railway,
Chennai-3. .. Respondents

By Advocate Mr.Eathirraj P.S.

ORDER
(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr.R.Ramanujam, Member(A))

The applicant's case is that while working as Senior Section Engineer in the year 2012, he was subjected to periodical re-medical examination and was found unfit to the said post. He was continued on the same post for some time in supernumerary capacity pending alternative appointment and later he was appointed alternatively as an Office Superintendent by order dated 22.10.2012. This, the applicant alleges was contrary to the mandatory provisions as his name was not included in the seniority list in the Ministerial cadre. The representations of the applicant dated 03.7.2012 and 23.12.2013 seeking alternative appointment in a technical cadre in workshop in and around Trichy were not responded to. Hence this OA seeking to quash the impugned order dated 22.10.2012 and consequently direct the appointment of the applicant in any of the technical posts in the workshops in and around Trichy.

2. The respondents in their reply have stated that the applicant is still working at TPJ Division under the control of AXEN/TM/TPJ where there is no provision for ministerial staff and having only technical staff. The posting as Office Superintendent had only been made at the request of the applicant.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing today, learned counsel for the applicant produces a copy of Office Order No.TM/81/2015 dated 16.9.2015 for Inter Divisional One Way transfer of the applicant and submits that the

respondents have already granted the relief sought in the OA and, therefore, the OA may be closed.

4. Office Order dated 16.9.2015 of the respondents is taken on record. As the relief sought by the applicant has already been granted, nothing survives in the OA. I, therefore, deem it appropriate to close the OA.

5. The OA is accordingly closed. No order as to costs.