

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 534 OF 1994.
Cuttack, this the 31st day of March, 2000.

SURENDRA PRADHAN.

....

APPLICANT.

VRS.

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

...

RESPONDENTS.

FOR INSTRUCTIONS

1. Whether it be referred to the reporters or not? ✓
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunal or not? ✓

(SOMNATH SOM)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

(G. NARASIMHAM)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 534 OF 1994.

Cuttack, this the 31st day of March, 2000.

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR. SOMNATH SOM, VICE-CHAIRMAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. NARASIMHAM, MEMBER (JUDL.) .

Sri Surendra Pradhan, Aged about 32 years,
Son of Sri Kembru Pradhan, At/Po: Sugudabedi,
Via: Raikia, Dist.: Phulbani.

: Applicant.

By legal practitioner: M/s. S.K Mohanty & S.P. Mohanty, Advocates.

- Versus -

1. Union of India represented by its Secretary,
Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Superintendent of Post Offices, Phulbani Division,
Phulbani,
3. Postmaster General, Berhampur Region, Berhampur;
4. Sri Rabindra Paricha, EDBPM, Sugudabedi BO,
At/Po: Sugudabedi Via Raikia, Dist. Phulbani.

: Respondents.

By legal practitioner: Mr. A.K. Bose, Senior Standing Counsel.

...

O R D E R

MR. G. NARASIMHAM, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Mr. A.K. Bose, learned Senior Standing Counsel for the Departmental Respondents present. None from the side of the applicant present. No adjournment has also been sought on behalf of applicant. Hence heard Mr. Bose, learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the Departmental Respondents and perused the records.

2. Applicant, S. Pradhan and Respondent No. 4, Rabindra Paricha were candidates for selection to the post of EDBPM, Sugudabedi Branch Post Office in the year 1992. Ultimately, Res. No. 4 was selected and appointed. Applicant in this Original Application prays for quashing the selection and appointment of Respondent No. 4 mainly on the ground that Respondent No. 4 though submitted application within the stipulated time, his application was incomplete inasmuch as the list of landed property was not filed and the Income certificate filed by Res. No. 4 was not correct.

3. Respondent No. 4 though duly noticed had not entered appearance. Department in the ir counter ^{here} ~~has~~ taken the stand that between the applicant and Respondent No. 4 the later was found to be more meritorious and suitable and both of them had not submitted the list of immovable property as called for under Annexure-R/1. As Res. No. 4 was found more suitable, he was asked to submit the necessary documents and after submission of documents, on perusal, he was selected and appointed. We do not see any illegality or irregularity in this selection and appointment of Respondent No. 4.

4. In the result, we find no merit in this Original Application which is accordingly rejected. No costs.

Somnath Som
(SOMNATH SOM)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

L. 1. 1 31.3.2000
(G. NARASIMHAM)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

KNM/CM.