## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AHMEDABAD BENCH, AHMEDABAD.

<del>RA/M.A</del> ./O.A./	T.A./	
G 17 A	malik	_Applicant (s).
	Pinp	_Adv. for the
		Petitioner (s).
	Versus	
min	g Inda 2 cm	Respondent (s).
	7 Min	Adv. for the Respondent (s)

SR NO.	DATE.	$\cap$	ORDERS,	
i		Domokim	( Cypy	not Served)
	5751 2 143/2	RDAD Reed from  This matteris  The first services	Resp. 2 (21102) not place on matter	573/9 donte pertenn for DE
		· ·		
		a fa		
		*		
		*		



CORAM : HON'BLE MR. G. S. NAIR .. VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. M. M. SINGH .. ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

## 14/3/1990

Heard the applicants in person as well as the counsel Mr.R.M.Vin appeared on behalf of the respondents who opposed the admission of the application.

The relief that is claimed is to quash the order dt. 18.4.84 by which the applicant was informed that he has not been considered suitable for promotion to the higher grade of Rs. 700-900. He has also prayed for grant of such promotion with effect from the date of which his juniors were promoted.

Inspector in the grade of R. 550-750 to the higher grade of Rs. 700-900 is based on seniority cum suitability. As such when his suitability was assessed vis-a-vis his juniors and he was not found suitable where upon his juniors were promoted, he can not complain about the denial of the promotion based on the promotion granted to the juniors. If the applicant was aggrieved by the assessment as regard his suitability for the purpose of promotion, it should be challenged the then, especially when he was specifically intimated by the letter dt. 18.4.84 about the non-suitability for the promotion.

The applicant submitted that representation was presented by him on 10.7.84 but it is not been replied to within

..2...

2

a reasonable period of presentation of the representation the applicant should have approached court of law for redressal of his grievances.

We reject the application.

M. M. Lun -

( M. M. Singh ) Administrative Member (G.S. Nair) Vice Chairman

R