

5
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK. J

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:350 OF 1991

Date of decision: 27th April, 1992.

Kumari Rajani Devi .. Petitioner

-Versus

Union of India and others .. Opp. Parties

..

For the Petitioner .. M/s Devananda Misra,
Deepak Misra,
R.N.Naik, A.Deo,
B.S.Tripathy,
P.Panda, Advocates.

For the Opp. Parties .. Mr.K.C.Mohapatra, Advocate
(No.4)

For the Opposite Parties .. Mr. A.K.Misra, St.Counsel.
(1 to 3)

..

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. K.P.ACHARYA, VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

THE HONOURABLE MR. C.S. PANDEY, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

....

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment? Yes.

....

1/2/11

J U D G M E N T

K.P.ACHARYA, V.C. In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the Petitioner prays to quash the selection of Opposite Party No.4 to the Post of Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Takarada Branch Post Office within the District of Ganjam and further prayer^{is} to direct the Opposite Parties to appoint the Petitioner against ~~the~~ said Post.

2. Shortly stated the case of the Petitioner is that after the post of E.D.B.P.M, Takarada Branch Post Office fell vacant, advertisement was made calling for applications from employment exchange and from open market to fillup the said post on regular basis. After the selection process was over, the competent authority selected Opposite Party No.4 i.e. Shri Dinabandhu Nayak. Being aggrieved by this order, the Petitioner Kumari Rajani Devi had approached this Tribunal with an application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 to quash the order of appointment issued in favour of Opposite Party No;4, which formed subject matter of O.A. 105 of 1989. This case was disposed of on 1st April, 1991. The Bench directed reconsideration of all the candidates including the Petitioner and Opposite Party No.4. The competent authority has again selected Opposite Party No.4 for which the Petitioner feels aggrieved and the said order of appointment is under challenge and sought to be quashed.

7

1/3/11

2

3. In their counter, the Opposite Parties maintained that no irregularity having been committed ⁱⁿ ~~by~~ the matter of selection of Opposite Party No.4, the impugned order of selection should be upheld and should not be quashed.

4. We have heard Mr. R.N.Naik learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Mr. Aswini Kumar Misra learned Standing Counsel at a considerable length. We have also perused the relevant records filed on behalf of the Petitioner and on behalf of the Opposite Parties. We find no irregularity to have been committed by the competent authority in the matter of selection of Opposite Party No.4. We therefore, find no merit in this application which stands dismissed leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

K. Mohanty
 MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

[Signature]
 27.4.92
 VICE CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal
 Cuttack Bench/K.Mohanty/27.4.

