

6

564
3/9/88

A3
1

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH

Original Application No. 1374 of 1988

DATED : 15.2.1995

Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member(A)
Hon'ble Mr. T.L. Verma, Member(J)

Kshetra Pal Singh, S/o Sri Bhoop Singh, ED.D. Postman,
Branch Post Office ~~Bagh~~ Bagh Raya, Aligarh.
Applicant.

By Advocate Shri Radha Mohan Pandey.

Versus

1. Union of India
2. Dak Maha Adhikshak, U.P. pari mandal, Lucknow.
3. Senior Superintendent of Postal Department,
Aligarh Division, Aligarh
4. Over seer Dak Ghar Baghraya, Aligarh.
5. Branch Post Master, Dak Ghar, Bagh Raya, Aligarh.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri N.B. Singh

O R D E R(Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member(A)

None for the applicant today also when the case was called out, as such, the case is liable to be dismissed in default. However, we proceeded to consider the case on merits, based on averments made in the O.A. and the counter-reply filed by the respondents. No rejoinder has been filed.

2. The applicant's case is that he was appointed as E.D.D. Postman on 06.10.1988 in the

7

A3
2

:: 2 ::

branch
sub/post office, Bagh Raya, Distt. Aligarh.
It is alleged that the respondents ~~was~~asked
for sponsoring of names for the post on which
the applicant was working and having come to
know of this, the applicant's mother submitted
representation for consideration of the applicant's
appointment on the ground that the applicant's
father was a political ^{officer} servant. It is alleged
that ~~the applicant was invited for employment~~
^{by another person was appointed}
by order dated 03.12.1988. The applicant's case
is that he was a son ~~of~~ political ^{officer} servant
and had passed the intermediate examination, so that
he has right to be considered for the post of
E.D.D.A. and has prayed for quashing of order
dated 03.12.1988 and a direction to the respondents
not to make any appointment during the pendency
of this application. He has also prayed that
an application dated 04.12.1988 submitted by
him be decided and he be paid salary.

3. It has been averred in the counter-
reply filed by the respondents that one Rajendra
Singh who was working as E.D.D.A. having been
promoted to the post of Group 'D', the applicant
was appointed as a substitute by Rajendra Singh,
In order to make regular appointment on that post,
the requisition was sent to the Employment Exchange
and several names were sponsored but, the ~~name~~
~~name~~ of the applicant does not find place in

uf.

.....

23/

(2)

A3
3

:: 3 ::

the said list. The respondents have considered the candidature of the names which ^{wey} ~~was~~ sponsored by the Employment Exchange and one Hari Kumar was selected and he has also taken over the charge on 19.1.1989.

4. The applicant has not filed any rejoinder affidavit in rebuttal of the contention made in the counter-reply.

5. It is clear from the counter-affidavit filed by the respondents that the applicant ^{was} only appointed as substitute and since his name for regular appointment ^{was not sponsored} ~~is made~~, the respondents could not consider the candidature of the applicant. We do not find any illegality committed by the respondents in inviting names for regular appointment and selecting one of the candidates who has been sponsored by the Employment Exchange. We see no merits in the case ^{is the same} and is accordingly dismissed.

There shall be no order as to costs

Jamen
Member (J)

W.C.
Member (A)

/M.M./