

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/021/00091/2021**

HYDERABAD, this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021

**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member  
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**



R.Rama Krishna, Gr-B,  
S/o Late R.Venkatapathi,  
Aged 59 years, Occ : Offtg SPOs,  
Sanga Reddy Division,  
R.K.Puram Post,  
Hyderabad – 500 102, T.S.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. B. Gurudas)

Vs.

1.Union of India, rep. by its Secretary,  
MoC & IT, Department of Post,  
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Director General,  
Department of Post,  
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi – 110 001.

3.The Chief Post Master General,  
Telangana Circle, Abids,  
Hyderabad – 500 001.

4.The Post Master General,  
Hyderabad Hqrs Region,  
Hyderabad 500 001. TS. ....Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. D. Laxmi Narayana Rao, Addl. CGSC)

---

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr.B.V.Sudhakar, Administrative Member)**

**Through Video Conferencing:**

2. The OA is filed by the applicant questioning the Memo. Dt. 11.01.2021 showing him under Extended Panel as illegal, arbitrary and against the Rules and seeks a consequential direction to the respondents to consider his case for promotion to PS Gr. B for the vacancy year 2020 along with his batchmate Sri V. Gunaseelan of 1996.

3. Brief facts of the case are that the applicant was declared successful for appointment as Inspector of Railway Mail Service (RMS) on 23.2.1996. Seniority of the applicant was shown against the year 2001 vide letter dated 1.6.2016 of the respondents. Representation was submitted by the applicant on 12.7.2018 representing to indicate his seniority against the year 1996 and followed it up by further representations on 30.10.2018 and 28.5.2020 to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, but of no avail. Applicant's name was shown at Sl. No.196/247 vide letter dated 11.1.2021, in the tentative eligibility list for promotion to Group-B cadre for the vacancy year 2020, instead of showing his name along with his batch mates.

4. The contentions of the applicant are that he belongs to the 1996 batch of Inspector cadre and not to 2001. Not disposing the representations submitted is arbitrary and illegal. If the applicant seniority is not restored, the applicant will suffer irreparable loss in terms of promotion to Group B, pay etc. Applicant is due to retire shortly in August 2021 and not restoring the seniority has caused severe mental agony.

5. Heard both the counsel and perused the pleadings on record.

6. I. The dispute is about not restoring the seniority of the applicant in the Inspector cadre. Applicant claims that he belongs to 1996 batch whereas the respondents are showing him against 2001 batch. Respondents released the tentative eligibility list for promotion to Group B on 11.1.2021 wherein the applicant was not shown along with his batch mates of 1996. Aggrieved about non restoration of seniority, applicant has preferred representations on 12.7.2018, 30.8.2018 & 28.5.2020 which, the applicant claims, have not been disposed. Applicant is retiring in August 2021 and therefore, pleads for early restoration of seniority so that he can be duly considered for promotion as per his eligibility and consequential pay hike.

II. On hearing both the sides, we direct the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to dispose of the representations referred to above, in regard to the seniority of the applicant, by keeping in view the contentions made in the OA, within 8 weeks from the date of receipt of this order or prior to considering candidates for selection to Group B posts for the year 2020, whichever is earlier, by issuing a speaking and reasoned order as per extent rules and in accordance with law, so that the grievance of the applicant is resolved aptly in time.

III. With the above direction, the OA is disposed of, at the admission stage without going into the merits. No order as to costs.

**(B.V.SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**  
*evr*

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**