

3

5

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK.

Original Application No.552 of 1993.

Date of decision : January 21, 1994.

Prafulla Kumar Sahoo ... Applicant.

Versus


Union of India and others ... Respondents.

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to the Reporters or not ? *no*
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of *no*
the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ?


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

21 JAN 94

 21.1.94
(K. P. ACHARYA)
VICE-CHAIRMAN.

6

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACKBENCH; CUTTACK.

Original Application No.552 of 1993.

Date of decision : January 21, 1994.

Prafulla Kumar Sahoo ...

Applicant.

Versus

Union of India and others ...

Respondents.

For the applicant ...

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

For the respondents....

Mr. Ashok Misra,
Sr. Standing Counsel (Central)

C O R A M;

THE HON'BLE MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN.

A N D

THE HON'BLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.)

O R D E R

K. P. ACHARYA, V.C., In this application, the applicant prays to direct the respondents to pay the arrear S.B. allowance i.e. from the date of publication of the aptitude test and to pass appropriate orders directing the respondents to allot duty in S.B. allowance post to the applicant.

2. Shortly stated, the case of the applicant is that he is an employee in the Postal Department and according to the applicant, he has been successful in the Aptitude test for which he should get a posting in the S.B. accounts section. Such order not having been passed by the appropriate authority, this application has been

for

5

7

filed with the aforesaid prayer.


3. In their counter, the respondents maintained that the case being devoid of merit is liable to be dismissed.

4. We have heard Mr. B. S. Tripathy, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Ashok Mishra, learned Senior Standing Counsel (Central) for the respondents. We cannot direct the concerned authority to post a particular employee in a particular post. It is always the discretion of the competent authority. But the main grievance of the applicant is that the representation filed by the applicant has not yet been disposed of. Therefore, the Chief Post Master General, Respondent No. 2 is directed to dispose of the representation filed by the applicant contained in Annexure-5 dated 8.5.1993 according to law.

5. Thus, this application is accordingly disposed of leaving the parties to bear their own costs.



 MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)
 21 JAN 94



 VICE-CHAIRMAN
 21-1-94

Central Administrative Tribunal,
 Cuttack Bench, Cuttack.
 January 21, 1994/Sarangi.