

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CALCUTTA BENCH
-- --

O.A. No. 478 of 1996.

Present : HON'BLE DR. B.C. SARMA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER.

HON'BLE MR. D. PURKAYASTHA, JUDICIAL MEMBER.

Sri. Raj Kumar Bhir,
S/o- Sanatan Bhir,
resident at Vill- Bamunary,
PO. Bamunary,
Dist- Hooghly.

Vrs.

1. Union of India,
service through the
Secretary, Ministry of Communication,
Dak-o-Tar Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Post Master General,
West Bengal, Yogayog Bhavan,
36, Central Avenue,
Calcutta.
3. post Master General,
General Post Office,
Calcutta- 1.
4. Senior Superintendent,
Deptt. of Posts, India,
South Hooghly Divn,
Serampore, Pin 712 201.
5. District Employment Officer,
District Employment Exchange,
PO. Serampore, Hooghly.
6. Gautam Goswami,
S/o- not known,
Vill- Gopalpur,
PS. Dhaniakhali,
Sibaichandi, Dist- Hooghly.

... .. Respondents.

For applicant : None.

For respondents : Mr. B.K. Chatterjee, Counsel.

Heard on : 17.11.97.


Ordered on : 17.11.97.




Contd..

O R D E R

1. This application was filed by the applicant raising the dispute about the selection to the post of Extra Departmental Branch Post Master at Bamunary Branch Post Office in Village Bamunary Rishra of Hooghly district.
2. When the admission hearing of the matter was taken up Mr. Chatterjee, Id. Counsel for the respondents, produced before us a copy of an appointment letter given to the applicant to the said post and it was issued on 2.7.1997. In the forwarding letter addressed to the Id. Counsel, the Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices, South Hooghly Divn. Serampore has explained that in this case the applicant was at Serial No. 2 position and since the candidate at Sl. No. 1 position could not provide rent free accommodation according to service condition, the applicant was given appointment.
3. We have considered the submission of Mr. Chatterjee, ~~and also~~ perused the record and also ^{perused} the copy of the letter produced before us. We find that on ~~earlier~~ date also none appeared for the applicant and today also when the admission hearing was taken up, none appears for the applicant. We are thus satisfied that it was perhaps on receipt of the appointment letter none appears for the applicant. ~~xxxx xixxx~~ In any case, we are of the opinion that the grievance of the applicant has been met and, accordingly, the application has become infructuous.
4. The application is, therefore, dismissed. No order is passed as regards costs. Copy of the letter produced by Mr. Chatterjee may be kept in file as a part of record after it has been attested by the Id. Counsel.


(D. Purkayastha)
Member (J)


(B.C. Sarma)
Member (A)