

Central Administrative Tribunal
Hyderabad Bench

OA No.020/205/2020



Hyderabad, this the 13th day of March, 2020

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

1. J. Sreenivasulu
 S/o J. Chalapathaiah (late)
 Age 57 years, Occ: Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Gr. B
 O/o Vijayawada Division, Krishna District,
 Vijayawada – 520 001.
2. D. Ramanaiah,
 S/o Yanadaiah (late) (Group B)
 Age 56 years, Occ: Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices
 O/O Bhimavaram Division, Bhimavaram
 West Godavari District – 534 201.
3. J. Pandari, S/o Muthaiah (late)
 Age 57 years, Occ: Supdt. of Post Office
 O/o Peddapalli Division, Karimnagar District
 Telangana State.
4. K. Jayaraju, S/o Raja Ratnam
 Age 56 years, Occ: Chief Postmaster
 O/o Hyderabad GOP, Hyderabad – 500 001.
5. K. Ramesh, S/o K. Nageswara Rao
 Age 56 years, Occ: Assistant Director (Admin.)
 O/o Chief Postmaster General
 A.P.Circle Office, Vijayawada – 520 010.
6. A. Kantha Rao, S/o A. Krishna Murthy
 Age 57 years, Occ: Supdt. of Post Offices
 O/o Parvathipuram Division
 Parvathipura
 Srikakulam Division, A.P. – 535501.
7. Sk. Shabbir, S/o Sk. Subhani

Age 57 years, Occ: Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices
O/o South East Division, Hyderabad – 520 002.

8. P.V.Ramana Reddy, S/o P. Venka Reddy (late)
Age 57 years, Occ: Sr. Postmaster,
Secunderabad H.O. ... Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri N. Vijay)

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Ministry of Communications and IT,
Department of Posts,
DAK Bhavan, New Delhi Represented by its Secretary
2. The Chief Post Master General,
A.P.Circle, Krishna Lanka, Vijayawada.
3. The Chief Post Master General,
Telangana State, G.P.O., Hyderabad. ... Respondent(s)

(By Advocate: Shri K. Bhim Singh proxy of Mr. M. Brahma Reddy, Sr. PC for CG)

O R D E R (Oral)

2. The OA is filed against the action of the respondents to alter the final seniority list of postal services Group – B cadre Officers as on 01.01.2012 issued by Respondent No.1 vide proceedings dated 16.09.2014.
3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicants were promoted as Postal Superintendent Group-B Officers in 2013 after holding DPC in 2012. There being administrative reasons for delay in issuing promotion





orders, applicants were included in the 2012 seniority list and the final seniority list of Group B officers as on 01.01.2012 was communicated vide proceedings dated 16.09.2014. Further, promotions to Group-A cadre were being effected on the basis of the said seniority list. So far so good. However, in the year 2019, respondents issued a draft seniority list for P.S. Group – B officers covering the years upto 2017 wherein the settled seniority position of the applicants as on 01.01.2012 was sought to be altered to their disadvantage. Applicants submitted their objections and brought to the notice of the respondents that **N.R.Parmar** Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was over ruled on 19.11.2019 in **K. Megha Chandra Singh**'s case. Applicants are on the verge of being promoted and the same not being processed in view of the draft seniority list, has led to the filing of the OA.

4. Various contentions and grounds were raised in paras 4 and 5 of the OA by the applicants.

5. Albeit, sufficient opportunities have been given to the learned respondents' counsel, who is appearing on receipt of an advance copy from the applicants to revert with respondents instructions, the same did not fructify. However, across the Bar, he has denied the contentions raised by the applicants in their OA, claiming that the action of the respondents is in tune with the policy on the subject.

6. Heard both the learned counsel and perused the pleadings on record.

7. After hearing both sides, it would be appropriate to direct the applicants to make a comprehensive representation within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, stating the rules and law under which they are seeking their relief prayed for in the OA, and on receipt of such representation, the respondents shall dispose of the same within 8 weeks by issuing a speaking and reasoned order. In case the applicants are aggrieved with the decision of the respondents on the matter, they are at liberty to approach the Tribunal, if they so desire, in accordance with rules and law.

With the above directions, the OA is disposed of with no order as to costs, at the admission stage, without going into the merits.

(B. V. Sudhakar)
Member (A)

nsn

