

(11)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH  
-----

Original Application No. 336 of 1987

Date of decision : July 14, 1988.

Sri Purna Chandra Sahoo, s/o- Sri Karunakar Sahoo,  
residing at Bhubaneswar, Dist- Puri, working as  
Enquiry & Reservation Clerk, South Eastern Railway,  
At/P.O/Dist- Puri. .. Applicant.

Versus

1. Union of India, represented through it's  
General Manager, South Eastern Railway,  
Garden Reach, Calcutta, West Bengal.
2. Divisional Commercial Superintendent,  
South Eastern Railway, Khurda Road,  
At/P.O- Khurda Road, Dist- Puri.
3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,  
Khurda Road, At/P.O- Khurda Road, Dist- Puri.

.. Respondents.

-----  
M/s M.R.Panda, G.R.Nai  
and P.K.Panda, Advocates .. For Applicant.

Mr. R.C.Rath, Standing Counsel  
(Railways) .. For Respondents.

C O R A M :

THE HON'BLE MR. B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. K.P.ACHARYA, MEMBER ( JUDICIAL)

- 
1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed  
to see the judgment ? Yes.
  2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ? NO
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair  
copy of the judgment? Yes .
-

J U D G M E N T

K.P. ACHARYA, MEMBER (J), In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the order contained in Annexure-2 transferring the petitioner from Bhubaneswar to Puri is under challenge .

2. Shortly stated , the case of the petitioner is that he was Enquiry and Reservation Clerk, South Eastern Railway posted at Bhubaneswar. Vide Annexure-2 , The petitioner was transferred to Puri for which he has a grievance and has invoked the jurisdiction of this Bench praying to quash Annexure-2.

3. In their counter , the respondents maintained that the petitioner had requested for performing table duty and should be given a posting. There being no such post at Bhubaneswar, he was transferred to Puri to do the table duty. In such circumstances , there being no merit in the application , the same is liable to be dismissed.

4. None appeared for the petitioner. we perused the record with the assistance of Mr. R.C. Rath, learned Standing Counsel for the Railway Administration and we have heard Mr. Rath at some length. The petitioner has already joined at Puri which is admitted by him in his petition. Mr. Rath also drew our attention to the contents of Annexure-A of the counter wherein the petitioner has prayed for being posted to a seat in which he could do table work. In such circumstances, we find no merit in the

application which stands dismissed leaving the parties  
to bear their own costs .

*legally*  
14.7.88  
.....  
Member ( Judicial)

B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN, *g agree.*



*Amr*  
14.7.88  
.....  
Vice Chairman.

Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Cuttack Bench.  
July 14, 1988/Roy, Sr.P.A.