

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH : ALLAHABAD**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.652 of 2005

**Allahabad; this the 22nd day of May, 2007**

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Khem Karan, Vice-Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. K.S.Menon, Member-A

1. Abhinay Srivastava, aged about 39 years, Son of Late A.S. Srivastava Resident of 16D/5C, Prayag Street, Allahabad. Presently posted as Programme Executive at All India Radio, Allahabad.
2. Mansha Ram Yaduvanshi, aged about 42 years, Son of Shri Dori Lal, Resident of C-12, Akashvani Colony, Rampur. Presently posted as Programme Executive at all India Radio, Rampur.

...Applicants.

(By Advocate : Shri S. Narain)

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, All India Radio, Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India), New Delhi.
3. The Station Director, All India Radio, Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India), Allahabad.
4. The Station Director, All India Radio, Rampur U.P.
5. Shri Digambar Singh, Farm Radio Reporter, A.I.R., Lucknow-U.P.
6. Shri Ragit Sinha, Transmission Executive (G&P), A.I.R. Patna (Bihar).
7. Shri Satyavrat Singh, Farm Radio Reporter, A.I.R., Mathura.
8. Shri N.S. Raghuvansh, Farm Radio Reporter, A.I.R., Faizabad, U.P.

...Respondents.

(By Advocate : Shri S. Singh)

O R D E R

By Hon'ble Mr. Justice Khem Karan, V.C. :

Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that his client has given latest seniority list dated 26.4.2007 of



Final All India Eligibility list of TREXs, Farm Radio Reporters and Field Reporters to him, in which the position of the applicant has more or less correctly been shown and if this eligibility list is to hold the field, the applicant may not remain aggrieved and the petition may be dismissed as such. What he says is that since the respondents are changing the stand off and on, so it should be ascertained as to whether principles given in letter dated 9.6.1999 (Annexure-7) have been followed or not.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents states that it is stated in the provisional eligibility list that principles given in order dated 18.9.2006, have been followed. Copy of this order dated 18.9.2006 has also been placed before us for our perusal. But counsel for the applicant says that his relief is that principles mentioned in OM dated 9.6.1999, should be adhered to, in preparing the eligibility list and order dated 18.9.2006 is silent on that point.

3. Matter appears to have come to an end with the issuance of eligibility list dated 26.4.2007 of which the applicant is not aggrieved. Whatever, the principles might have been followed in preparing this list of 26.4.2007, the applicant is not aggrieved of the list.

4. We are of the view that the OA has become infructuous after issuance of fresh eligibility list dated 26.4.2007, which, according to the applicant, is to his satisfaction. So the OA is dismissed as infructuous. In case the respondents issue any fresh list disturbing the position of the applicant, the applicant shall be free to approach this Tribunal.

*[Signature]*  
Member-A 22.5.07

*[Signature]*  
22.5.07  
Vice-Chairman

RKM/