

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW**

(HEARING THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

Sl. No. 1

Dated: 03.12.2020

Joint Appl: 332/01126/2020

In O.A. No. 332/00286/2020

1. Bholendra Pal, aged about 38 years, S/o Shri Chhotkannu, R/o620/1-F-8 Bawan Chungi, Aaloo Thok, Hardoi.
2. Akhilesh Kumar aged about 42 years, S/o Late Ram Prakash Agnihotri, R/o Village & Post Umrauli, and District Hardoi.

By Advocate : Shri Dharmendra Awasthi.

....Applicants.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Communication, Department of Posts, Government of India, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Chief Postmaster General, U.P. Circle, Lucknow.
3. Assistant Postmaster General (TG & DE) o/o Chief PMG, U.P. Circle, Lucknow.
4. Superintendent of Posts Offices, Hardoi Division, Hardoi.

...Respondents.

By Advocate : Smt. Prayagmati Gupta

ORDER (ORAL)

HON'BLE MR. A. MUKHOPADHAYA, MEMBER (A)

This is a Division Bench matter. Division Bench is not convened today.

2. Joint Application No.332/01126/2020 under Rule 4 (5)(a) pursuing the case jointly is allowed as the applicants have a common cause of action and are similarly situated employees.

3. At the very outset, Shri Dharmendra Awasthi, learned counsel for applicants, submitted that he would be satisfied if the representation given by the applicants to the respondents on 20.08.2020 with regard to their appointment/promotion as Post Man/Mail Guard is considered and disposed of by the respondents in a time bound manner. On it being pointed out that the representation dated 20.8.2020 at Annexure-A-9 is signed only by the applicant No. 2, Shri Akhilesh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant Shri Dharmendra Awasthi, confirmed to the court that the applicant No.1, Shri Bholendra Pal, has also submitted a similar representation to the respondents, but that, inadvertently, a copy of the same was not annexed to the O.A. He prayed that the representations dated 20.8.2020 submitted by both the applicants be considered by the respondents.

4. At this, Ms. Prayagmati Gupta, learned counsel for the respondents, stated that the respondents have no objection to consider these representations, but pointed out that the representation from the first applicant could only be considered in case it had actually been received by the respondents, as stated by learned counsel for the applicant.

5. Looking to the aforementioned position and without entering into the merits of the case, but only going by the balance of convenience in the matter, I deem it appropriate to direct the respondents to

consider the representations submitted by the applicant No.2, dated 20.08.2020, (Annexure A-9), and the similar representation submitted by the applicant No. 1 dated 20.8.2020 (if received), and dispose of the same by way of reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

6. Accordingly, the O.A. stands disposed of at the admission stage itself.

7. There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.MUKHOPADHAYA)
MEMBER (A)

vidya