

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH.

...

O.A. No. 112 of 1995

Dated: 14.02.1995

Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member(A)  
Hon. Mr. T.L. Verma, Member (J)

Madar Bux son of Rahim Bux, E.D. Runner  
Bhauri Karvi Line( Karvi) district  
Banda, resident of Karvi District Banda. ....Applicant.

Versus

1. The Union of India, through  
Secretary , Ministry of Communication  
Department of Posts, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Department of Post,  
New Delhi.
3. The Chief Postmaster General, U.P.  
Lucknow.
4. The Post Master Generak, Kanpur.
5. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Banda Division, Banda. ....Respondents.

...

O R D E R

- - - - -

( By Hon. Mr. S1 Das Gupta, Member(A) )

Heard Sri Vijai Bahadur, learned counsel for  
the applicant on admission.

The applicant in this case has been working as  
E.D. Runner since 18.9.1975 on daily wages basis.

While working as such, he was waylaid by some  
~~miscreants~~  
~~miscreants~~ who tried to snatch away government  
money which he was carrying. He resisted and even  
though he suffered injuries, he was able to protect  
the government property. He was given cash award  
and his bravery was acknowledged. It appears that

W.P.

(3)

- 2 -

another person also met with a similar incident and he was rewarded by being given a permanent employment as Class-IV employee. The applicant's grievance is that he has not been given similar treatment. He sent a representation for being given similar treatment but vide communication dated 7.9.1992, he was informed that his application has been rejected. Another representation dated 12.12.1992/27.12.1992 was sent to the C.P.M.G. U.P. Circle which was followed by further representation dated 8.4.1993. These representations were rejected by communication dated 15.4.1993.

2. The applicant has now approached this Tribunal praying for quashing of the communications dated 7.9.1992 and 15.4.1993 and also for issuing a direction to the respondents to consider another representation which he has submitted and which is stated to be pending

3. The applicant has taken the plea that under Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution, he should have been granted similar treatment.

4. We have carefully considered the submissions made in the original application and also the oral submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant. We are firmly of the view that no

wf

(C.U.)

- 3 -

case has been ~~not~~ made out by the applicant and  
the application is totally devoid of any merits.  
The application is, therefore, dismissed  
in limine.

*J. Shulman*  
Member (J)

*W. R.*  
Member (A)

(n.u.)