

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

OA/021/00603/2020

HYDERABAD, this the 30th day of September, 2020.

Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member

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



Ch.Koteswara Rao S/o late Venkatapathi,
Aged about 61 years,
Occ : Assistant Branch Postmaster,
Gr 'C', Sakinaveedu Branch Post Office,
a/w. Yerrupalem Sub Post Office,
Madira Sub Division, Khammam District.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr.B.Pavan Kumar)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep by the
Chief Postmaster General,
Telangana Circle, Abids,
Hyderabad-500001.
2. The Postmaster General,
Hyderabad Region,
Hyderabad-500001.
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Khammam Division,
Khammam-507 003.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Mrs.K.Rajitha, Sr.CGSC)

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

Through Video Conferencing:



The O.A. is filed challenging the action of the respondents in not considering any of the options submitted by the applicant for the purpose of posting, while declaring his post Assistant Branch Postmaster as surplus vide letter dated 14.9.2020.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the post of the applicant namely Assistant Branch Postmaster, MC/MD, Sakinaveedu Branch Post Office was declared as surplus by the respondents vide their letter dated 14.9.2020. Consequent to declaration of the post as surplus, the applicant has to be posted in a place of his choice is the claim of the applicant. However, the respondents instead of posting him in the place of choice indicated by him directed him to join in other places than those preferred by him.

3. The contentions of the applicant revolve around the fact that it is the respondents who declared his post as surplus. Therefore, having declared the post as surplus, they should allow him to join in a place of his choice. Instead of doing so, the respondents are forcing him to join other places, which is unfair according to the applicant.

4. Heard Sri B. Pavan Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs. K. Rajitha, learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, and perused the records.

5. It is not under dispute that the post of the applicant has been declared as surplus. After declaring the post as surplus, respondents are going to accommodate him in some other post. While doing so, the applicant claims that the place of choice preferred by him should be considered. However, the applicant claims that the respondents have not agreed to the same and are trying to post the applicant to a far off location. Consequently, being apprehensive that he will be posted to a far off place, the applicant made a representation on 22.09.2020. The Staff Union of the Gramina Dak Sevaks has also taken up the issue with the respondents on 23.9.2020 and requested to take a favourable view in applicant's case. In view of the above, it would be fair and proper on our part to direct the respondents to dispose of the representation made by the applicant on 22.9.2020 in terms of the relevant rules and in accordance with law by issuing a reasoned and speaking order within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order. The respondents are directed accordingly. They are further directed to maintain status quo for a period of one week from the date of disposal of the representation in order to enable the applicant to approach the Tribunal, in case he is aggrieved with the decision of the respondents.



With the above direction, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage. There shall be no order as to costs.