OPEN COURT

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD

* * *

Allahabad : Dated this 3rd day of August, 1999

Original Application No. 216 of 1999

District :Allahabad

CORAM

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr. S.K. Agrawal, J.M.

Kamla Shankar Tripathi
S/o Ram Adhar Tripathi
R/o Village and Post Dayura
Tahsil Karchana District-Allahabad.

(Sri LC Pandey, Advocate)

. . . . . Applicant

versus

1. Union of India through
Pravar Adhikshak Dakghar,
Allahabad Mandal Allahabad.

2. Branch Post Master Dayura,
Tahsil Karchana Distt-Allahabad.

3. The Employment Officer, Allahabad.

4. Shyam Ji Pandey S/o Shiv Baran Pandey
R/o Dayura Tahsil Karchana
District-Allahabad.

(Sri NB Singh/Sri KP Singh, Advocates)

. . . . . .Respondents

O R D E R (O r a l)

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

This application has been filed for a direction to the respondents not to appoint anyone till final disposal of the application and if appointmentis made it should be quashed. Another prayer made is that the applicant be allowed to fill up the form of Sakha Dak Pal and may be appointed. Directions were also sought to respondent no.3 who is the EmploymentExchange Officer, Allahabad to send name of the applicant before respondent no.1.

2. We find from the application that the applicant who is enrolled with the Employment Exchange Allahabad having Registration No.C/22202/95 on 18- 9-1995, wanted his name to be sponsored by the Employment Exchange as one of the five candidates sponsored for being considered against the vacancy of Branch Post Office Dayura, Karchana, District Allahabad. The applicant claims to have filed a representation on 9-2-1998 in which he stated that the name of Shyamji Pandey was wrongly sponsored because his Registration was 28111/95 and his registration was done on 10-11-95.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents has filed a counter reply in this case. It has been mentioned in the counter reply that the application of the applicant was not received within time which was upto 28-12-1997. The application has been stated to be received on 24-2-1998. Respondent no.3 has also filed his counter reply in this case and has mentioned that the applicant had got himself registered his name as Intermediate Pass candidate against Code No.C/22202/95 on 18-9-1995. The names which were sponsored were from the category of High School Pass. The applicant did not figure in that category.

4. Since the reasons for not sponsoring of the applicant by the Employment Exchange appears to be valid and the application of the applicant is stated to be received beyond time, we do not consider that the applicant is entiled to the relief sought for. The application is, therefore, dismissed as lacking merit. No order as to costs.

Member (J) Member (A)

Dube/