

14.5.2002

HON.MR.JUSTICE R.R.K.TRIVEDI,V.C.

HON.MR.C.S.CHADHA, MEMBER(A)

List has been revised. None is present for the applicant. Heard Ms.Sadhana Srivastava learned counsel for the respondents. Order dictated, typed separately.


MEMBER(A)
VICE CHAIRMAN

Uv/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ALLAHABAD BENCH

THIS THE 14TH DAY OF MAY, 2002

Original Application No. 1245 of 1997

CORAM:

HON.MR.JUSTICE R.R.K.TRIVEDI, v.c.

Hon.Mr.C.S.Chadha, MEMBER(A)

Rukmesh Kumar Sharma, son of
Shri Chunni lal Sharma,
R/o Village and Post Narau,
district Bulandshahar

... Applicant

versus

1. Union of India through Secretary
Department of Post, Dak Tar Bhavan
Parliament Street, New Delhi.
2. Supdt. of Post Offices, Deptt of
Post, Bulandshahar Division,
Bulandshahar.
3. Post Master General, Department of Post
Agra Region, Agra.
4. Sub-Divisional Inspector of Post
East Dibai, district Bulandshahar.
5. Shri D.K.Sharma, Sub-Divisional
Inspector of Post, East Dibai,
Bulandshahar.

... Respondents

(By Adv: Ms.Sadhna Srivastava)

O R D E R(Oral)

JUSTICE R.R.K.TRIVEDI,V.C.

By this OA u/s 19 of A.T.Act 1985 applicant has
prayed for a direction for quashing the notification
dated 1.5.1997 and to quash the entire process of
selection undertaken in pursuance to said
notification and to further not to issue any
appointment letter in pursuance of the selection held.



:: 2 ::

The facts of the case are that the post of EDBPM of branch post office Narau, district Bulandshahar fell vacant on account of termination of services of Sri Veer Singh. The post was advertised on 3.10.1996. The names were called from the Employment Exchange. The Employment Exchange sponsored five names including the name of the applicant. Out of five names only one was found eligible for appointment as EDBPM. Therefore, a fresh notification was issued on 1.5.1997 under which two more eligible candidates ~~were~~^{also} applied and out of them one Rajesh kumar Sharma was appointed.

In counter reply detailed reasons have been mentioned. The applicant was involved in a case u/s 302 IPC and was tried in Session Trial No.358/92 which was reported in Police verification. In the circumstances, we do not find that any illegality has been committed. Further, we noticed that by order dated 28.11.2000 this Tribunal directed the applicant to file an amendment application for impleadment of Rajesh Kumar Sharma as respondent no.6 which in this case has not been filed. Neither the application has been filed, nor Rajesh kumar Sharma has been impleaded. For this reason also applicant is not entitled for the relief.

The OA is accordingly dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.


MEMBER(A)
VICE CHAIRMAN

Dated: 14.5.2002

Uv/