

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Principal Bench

O.A. No. 3294 of 1992

(X)

New Delhi, dated the 17th February, 1998

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE Mrs. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)

Jagbir Singh,
S/o Shri Dalip Singh,
R/o 681/31, Ashok Vihar,
Dist. Sonapat,
Haryana.

... APPLICANT

(None appeared)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through
the Secretary,
Ministry of Telecom.
Govt. of India,
New Delhi.
2. General Manager/Chief General Manager,
Delhi Telephones,
Khurshid Lal Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. Shri Sushil Kumar,
Technician,
Posted at A.E. Electrical-I,
G.M.M., Khurshid Lal Bhawan,
New Delhi.
4. Shri Vijender Kumar Goel,
Technician,
Posted at A.E. (E-10B),
Shakti Nagar D-II,
Delhi.
5. Shri Ambika Prasad Chaudhary,
Technician,
Jor Bagh Exchange,
New Delhi.
6. Shri Jai Prakash Sharma,
Technician,
7. Shri Udai Bhan Patel,
Technician,
Karol Bagh Exchange,
New Delhi.-

... RESPONDENTS

(None appeared)

ORDER (Oral)

BY HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

Applicant seeks Selection for the post of Telecom. Technical Assistant. according to his seniority w.e.f. 5.6.92.

2. None appeared for applicant when the case was called even on the second call. None appeared for respondents either.

3. As this a very old case, which was filed as far back as 17.12.92 and was at Sl. No.8 in to-day's regular list, we are disposing it of on the basis of available materials on record.

4. Respondents have correctly pointed out that applicant has no legal right to be promoted and is entitled only for consideration for promotion subject to his possessing the eligibility qualifications, etc. for the same. They state that applicant's case was considered by a duly constituted DPC for promotion, to the selection post of Telecom. Technical Assistant but that DPC did not recommend his name. Applicant represented against the same and the respondents replied to the same stating that he was not considered ^{fit} for promotion.

5. Respondents further state that it was thereafter decided to hold a review DPC, before ^{whom?} ~~which~~ applicant's case was also included. (16)

6. From applicant's rejoinder it is seen that consequent to the recommendation of the review DPC, he has been promoted to the post of TTA w.e.f. 2.8.93.

7. As the applicant stands promoted as TTA, the principal relief sought for in the O.A. has since been granted. In the event any grievance in regard to his counting seniority in the post of TTA, it will be open to him to agitate the same through appropriate original proceedings, in accordance with law, if so advised.

8. Subject to above, the O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Mrs. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
Member (J)

/GK/

S.R. Adige
(S.R. ADIGE)
Vice Chairman (A)