

(5)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.No.1903/1994

New Delhi, This the 12th Day of October 1994

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur, Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member (A)

Shri A Karuppaswamy
No.1237, Sector XII
R K Puram
New Delhi.

..Applicant

By Shri K B S Rajan, Advocate

versus

Union of India

1. Through the Secretary
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Shastry Bhavan, New Delhi.

2. The Director General A.I.R.
Akashvani Bhavan
Parliament Street, New Delhi.

3. The Principal Information Officer
Press Information Bureau
Govt of India
Shastry Bhavan, New Delhi.

4. Dr.P.K.Bandyopadhyay
D.P.I.O. Press Information Bureau
Shastry Bhavan, New Delhi 110 001.

5. Smt Urmila Gupta
Dy Director General
Doordharsan
Parliament Street
New Delhi 110 001.

6. Shri P.S.Bhatnagar
Director of Public Relations(Defence)
Ministry of Defence
South Block, New Delhi.

..Respondents

By Shri M K Gupta, Counsel for respondents No.1 to 3

ORDE R(oral)

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C.Mathur, Chairman

1. Applicant who is a member of the Indian
Information Service is aggrieved by his non
selection for foreign posting. The plea of
the applicant is that discrimination has been
practised and no relevant criteria was adopted
by the Selection Board.

2. The examination of the proceedings of the Selection Board indicates that the names of the eligible officers were arranged in order of seniority and placed before the selection board. In this eligibility list the name of the applicant appears as Serial No.20 along with other junior administrative officers in the grade of Rs.3700-5000/-.

Another matter brought to the notice of the Selection Board was the period of foreign posting if any by the officers concerned. Against the name of the applicant it was mentioned that he had served in Sri Lanka from 31.5.90 to October 91. The Selection Board formulated a certain guidelines for selection of candidates. In our opinion the the criteria followed by the Selection Board does not suffer from any infirmities.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant has not brought to our notice any statutory provision which creates a right to claim foreign posting. However, it appears from the material on record that all officers are considered in order of seniority and thereafter preference is given to those who did not have an earlier posting abroad. In the present case, the officers were considered in order of seniority. The period of applicant's foreign posting was also available to the Selection Board. The Selection Board was competent to select the applicant or to reject. At the most the applicant can claim consideration and not a foreign posting itself. Since he has been considered on a relevant criteria, we do not find any fault in the selection made by the Selection Board.

4. At this stage the learned counsel for the applicant mentioned that the applicant had not completed his earlier tenure at Sri Lanka. But this has not vitiated the selection as his earlier posting at Sri Lanka was available to the Selection Board.

5. In view of the above the application lacks merit and is therefore dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

1.1.257

(P.T.THIRUVENGADAM)
Member (A)
12-10-94

Janam

(S.C.MATHUR)
Chairman
12-10-94

LCP