

4

5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

Original Application No. 384 of 1991

Date of Decision: 26.5.1993

Bijaya Chandra Nayak

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

For the applicant

M/s.Devanand Misra
Deepak Misra
R.N.Naik,A.Deo,
B.S.Tripathy
P.Panda,
Advocates

For the respondents

Mr.Aswini Kumar Misra
Standing Counsel
(Central Government)

...

C O R A M:

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

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN)

...

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

...

5

JUDGMENT

6

MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN, Shorn of unnecessary details, it would suffice to say that name of Opposite Party No. 5 was sponsored by the Employment Exchange for appointment to the post of Extra Departmental Delivery Agent in Rengalo Branch Post Office, and the petitioner had functioned in the said post for nearly seven months. Grievance of the petitioner is that he was not considered along with other candidates and therefore appointment of Opposite Party No. 5 should be cancelled. We do not like to express any opinion at present regarding the wider publication inviting applications from the intending candidates for the post of Extra Departmental Delivery Agent, which we shall express in an appropriate case, but in the present case, we would say that the name of the petitioner not having been sponsored by the Employment Exchange, there was no scope for the concerned authority to consider the case of the petitioner. Since the case of Opposite Party No. 5 was duly considered along with other candidates, and she has been appointed on regular basis, we do not like to interfere with this matter. Hence we find no merit in this application which stands dismissed leaving the parties to bear their own cost.

2. Before we part with this case, ^{We would say that} _{Mr. Deepak Mishra,} learned counsel for the petitioner submitted ^{that the} _{Mr.} ^{the} petitioner would make a representation to the Chief Post

2

6

General
 Master and concerned Superintendent of Post Offices for
^{him} for adjusting the petitioner in some other nearby post
 office. We have no objection. The petitioner, if so
 advised, may make a representation to the Chief Post Master
 General and the concerned Superintendent of Post Offices;
^{that} and we hope and trust, his case would be sympathetically
 considered by the concerned authority. Experience gained
 by the petitioner will certainly be taken into consideration

1. S. Sahoo
 MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

26.5.93.
 VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal
 Cuttack Bench, Cuttack
 dated the 26.5.1993/ B.K. Sahoo