

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

order NO. 6. Dated 18.03.99.

3
Court to be filed within four weeks.
posted to 20.04.99.

Vice-Chairman 18.3.99
Member (J)

03.11.03

Put up for hearing on 27.11.03.

Vice-Chairman 3/11
Member G

Order dated 27.11.2003

None appeared for the applicants nor the applicants did appear in person when called. However, Shri J.K.Nayak, learned Addl. Standing Counsel was present. With the aid and assistance of Shri Nayak we have perused the materials placed on record and also heard him.

The grievance of the applicants is that the Respondents carried out the selection for the post of Postal Assistants/Sorting Assistants advertised vide their notice bearing No.RE/6-1/Ch.II/98 dated 4.9.1998 (Annexure-1) in a discriminatory manner. Besides, the Respondents-Department did not honour the computer certificates obtained by the applicant from Lakhota Computer Centre, Bhawanipatna, which They have, therefore submitted that the action of the Respondents in not issuing call letters to them and/or not allowing them to appear in the selection

~~xx~~

Four copies of the order
dated 27.11.03
issued to counsel for
both sides.

DB
1.12.03
S-O(T)

test for the post of PA/SA was illegal and this is why they have approached this Tribunal to declare the entire selection process as illegal and null and void.

The Respondents by filing a detailed counter have contested the allegations made by the applicants. They have submitted that the selection was carried out in a most transparent manner as notified in the newspaper and also through various instructions issued by the D.G.Posts. As per the process of selection notified in the vacancy circular, they had counted the highest percentage of marks of the applicants in respect of educational attainments. It is their case that as per the norms fixed the applicants secured 20.40% and 28.73% marks whereas the select list was prepared basing on 30.20% marks. The applicant has not contested this fact as brought out by the Respondents in their counter by filing rejoinder. In the aforesaid background of the matter, we do not see any merit in this O.A., which is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

Abur 27/11
VICE-CHAIRMAN
Abur 27/11
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)