

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/20/100/2020

HYDERABAD, this the 31ST DAY OF JANUARY 2020

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member

CH. VENKATESWARLU,
S/o Ch. Prakasa Rao,
Aged 43 years,
Occ: Former Extra Departmental
Mail Carrier Delivery Agent,
R/o Kambala Dinne Village,
Botlagudur S.O. Prakasam District,
Andhra Pradesh.

...

Applicant

(By advocate: Mr. A Y Vishes Kumar)

Vs.

1. The Union of India rep. by:
The Director General of Posts,
New Delhi,
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
A.P.Circle, Hyderabad,
3. The Director of Postal Services,
O/o Postmaster General,
Vijayawada Region, Vijayawada 520003,
4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Prakasam Division, Ongole 523001,
5. The Assistant Superintendent of Posts
Kandukuru Sub Division, Kandukuru,
Prakasam District.

Respondents

(By advocate: Mrs. L Pranathi Reddy, Addl.CGSC)



ORAL ORDER

(PER HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE L NARASIMHA REDDY, CHAIRMAN)

Applicant claims that he worked as Gramin Dak Sevak (GDS) for a period of two years between 1999 to 2000 and for a period of 4 years between 2008 to 2012. Respondents issued a Notification No.RE/APCO/3-11/2019 proposing to appoint GDSs for various places. Applicant contends that his case is not being considered on the ground that he is over aged. Accordingly, he filed this O.A with a prayer to direct the respondents to take into the services rendered by him and to exclude the same for determining his age limit.



2.. We heard Mr. A Y Vishesh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. L. Pranathi Reddy, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

3.. The notification stipulated the age limit of 18 years minimum and 40 years maximum as on 15.10.2019. Further, the facility of relaxation is provided in respect of six categories of persons. Applicant claims to be OBC and for him relaxation to the extent of 3 years is provided. It is stated that even after extending the benefit of relaxation, the applicant is over aged. No one can help in this situation.

4.. We do not find any merit in the O.A. and accordingly it is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. .

(B V SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE L NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN

vsn