

Open Court

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**ALLAHABAD BENCH**  
**ALLAHABAD.**

Allahabad this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021

**Original Application No. 330/00244/2021**

**Hon'ble Mr. Tarun Shridhar, Member (Administrative)**

Shahida Begum, a/a 56 years, Wife of Late Isha, Resident of Saidabad,  
Toderpur, District - Allahabad.

**. . .Applicant**

**By Advocate : Shri Dinesh Kumar Rai**

**V E R S U S**

1. Union of India through Secretary, Postal Department, Government of U.P. at New Delhi.
2. Post Master General U.P. at Lucknow.
3. Senior Superintendent of Head Post Officer, Allahabad Division Allahabad.
4. Inspector of Sub- Divisional Post office Handia Sub Division Allahabad.
5. Post Master of Saidabad Post Office, Saidabad, District Allahabad.

**. . .Respondents**

**By Adv: Shri Chakrapani Vatsyayan**

**O R D E R**

**By Hon'ble Mr. Tarun Shridhar, Member (Administrative)**

I have joined this Bench online through video conferencing facility.

2. Shri Dinesh Kumar Rai, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.K. Sharma holding brief of Shri Chakrapani Vatsyayan, learned counsel for the respondents are present in Court.

3. The applicant (Shahida Begum) has submitted that she is a widow and has been working temporarily as a Sweeper in the Post Office at Allahabad since the year 1992. Her limited claim in this OA is for payment of appropriate wages to her, as according to her statement she gets only an amount of Rs.600/- per month. In addition, she seeks a consideration for her request for a regular appointment as a Sweeper.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has made a representation dated 16.10.2020 to the respondents specifically to respondent No.3, which is still pending, and at this stage he makes a limited prayer for a judicious disposal of this representation.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents agrees that the respondents would be inclined to consider the representation on the basis of facts as are obtained in official records and take appropriate decision in accordance with law and rules. However, he makes a specific mention that this should not further become a cause to seek relief in the OA by putting it as an evidence of condonation of delay since the applicant expects the relief from the year 1992 onwards, and this according to them can certainly not be admitted.

6. Accordingly, the OA is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to dispose of the representation dated 16.10.2020 of the applicant in accordance with rules within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. No order as to costs. It is made clear that onus is also on the applicant to furnish appropriate documents in support of her claim.

7. I have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Tarun Shridhar)  
Member(Administrative)

RKM/