

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD**

**O.A. No. 020/00534/2014**

HYDERABAD, THIS THE 22<sup>nd</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2020

**THE HON'BLE MR. ASHISH KALIA, MEMBER (J)**

**THE HON'BLE MR. B.V.SUDHAKAR, MEMBER (A)**

V SRINIVASA RAO,  
S/o Satyanarayana,  
Aged about 35 years,  
Occ: Gramin Dak Sevak MC/MD,  
Chivatam BO, A/w Vundrajavaram SO,  
West Godavari District.

...Applicant.

(By Advocate: Dr. A.RAGHU KUMAR)



**Vs.**

1. The Union of India, Rep. by its Secretary,  
Government of India, Ministry of Communications & IT.,  
Department of Posts – India, DakBhavan, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi 110 001.
2. The Chief Post Master General, A.P.Circle, Abids,  
Hyderabad – 500 001.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Bhimavaram Division,  
Bhimavaram 534 201,
4. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Tanuku Sub Division, Tanuku 534 211.

...Respondents.

(By Advocate:Mr. T.Hanumantha Reddy, Sr.PC for CG)

**ORAL ORDER**

PER HON'BLE Mr. **ASHISH KALIA, MEMBER (J)**

Following reliefs are sought by the applicant:

“To call for records pertaining to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent Memo No.B1/PA/Rectt/UF/BP/2011 & 2012 dated 22.03.2014 and declare the same as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, violative of the Recruitment Rules of Postal Assistants and Sorting Assistants 2011 validly made under Article 309 of Constitution of India and in view of the fact that the appeal/petition of the applicant is pending both against the rejection order and as well as the punishment order and consequently declare that the applicant is entitled for appearing for the examination scheduled to be held on 25.05.2014 for the promotion to the post of Postal Assistant and consequent promotion with all consequential benefits in the interest of justice.”



2. We heard the learned counsel on both sides.
3. We have perused the result of the examination for Postal Assistant and found that the applicant has not been qualified.
4. There is, therefore, no point in keeping this OA pending. O.A is accordingly dismissed.
5. There shall be no order as to costs.

(B V SUDHAKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

(ASHISH KALIA)  
MEMBER (J)

vsn