

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
LUCKNOW BENCH
(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)**

O.A. 113/2021

This, the 9th day of September, 2021.

HON'BLE MS. JASMINE AHMED, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. A MUKHOPADHAYA, MEMBER (A)

Dipendra Kumar, aged about 44 years, S/o
Shri Rajendra Prasad, R/o Kamlabad Badhauili,
Post-Kamlabad Badhauili, Tehsil Bakshi Ka Talab,
Lucknow.

.....Applicant

By Advocate: Shri Praveen Kumar.

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through Chief Post Master General, UP Circle, Lucknow.
2. The Post Master General, Lucknow Region, Lucknow.
3. The Assistant Director (Recruitment), Lucknow.
4. The Senior Superintendent of Posts, Lucknow Division, Lucknow.

...Respondents

By Advocate: Ms. Prayagmati Gupta.

O R D E R (ORAL)

By HON'BLE MR. A MUKHOPADHAYA, M-A

At the outset, Shri Praveen Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant, submitted that the applicant, who is a disabled person, had represented earlier to the respondents for posting at a particular station, SO Abdul Kalam University, Jankipuram Extension, Lucknow. However, vide the impugned order dated 04.2.2021, which was passed after the passage of an order dated 11.1.2021, in Writ Petition No. 545 (S/S) of 2021 by the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad, Lucknow Bench, the respondents have rejected the applicant's representation and posted one Shri Dharmendra Kumar Tiwari against that vacancy on the ground that the said Shri Tiwari is senior to the applicant. In the circumstances, learned counsel for the applicant submits that pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 11.01.2021, in Writ Petition No. 545/2021, he is approaching this Tribunal with a plea to be given leave to prefer a fresh representation for posting at one of two places, SO Bakshi Ka Talab, Lucknow and SO Maharshi IIM Road, Lucknow, as these posts are reportedly still vacant.

2. Applicant's counsel further submitted that he would be satisfied, if a direction is given to the respondents to consider his fresh representation within a reasonable time frame and dispose of the same by way of a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law. At this, Ms. Prayagmati Gupta, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that if the applicant's fresh representation is to be directed in the manner suggested, a period of at least two months would be necessary for this.

3. Looking to the limited nature of the plea made by the learned counsel for the applicant, we deem it

appropriate, without entering into the merits of case, to dispose of this OA at the stage of admission itself by directing the applicant to make a fresh comprehensive representation to the respondents with regard to being posted as aforementioned within a period of two weeks from date. In the event of such a representation being received within the stipulated period, the respondents shall consider and dispose of the same by way of a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within a period of two months of its receipt.

4. O.A. is disposed of accordingly.
5. There will be no order on costs.

(A. MUKHOPADHAYA)
MEMBER (A)

(MS. JASMINE AHMED)
MEMBER (J)

vidya