

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM

O. A. No. 418/90
~~TXXXX~~

199

DATE OF DECISION 15-1-1991

Shirly Joseph Applicant (s)

Mr Lal George Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus

Union of India rep. by the Respondent (s)
Secretary to Government of India,
Deptt. of Communications, New Delhi
and another.

Mr K Prabhakaran, ACGSC Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. NV Krishnan, Administrative Member

The Hon'ble Mr. N Dharmadan, Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? ☒
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? ☒
4. To be circulated to all Benches of the Tribunal? ☒

JUDGEMENT

Shri NV Krishnan, A.M.

The applicant has sought the following reliefs in this case:

- (i) to declare that the applicant is entitled to be considered for selection and appointment as Junior Telecom Officer on the basis of the marks obtained by her in part III of B.Sc. examination;
- (ii) direct the 2nd respondent to consider the applicant alongwith others and in preference to those who have lesser marks than that of the applicant and to appoint the applicant in accordance with law with all consequent benefits;
- (iii) to set aside the interview and selection made by the 2nd respondent to the post of Junior Telecom Officers;

(iv) grant such other reliefs as may be prayed for and this Hon^{ble} Tribunal may deem fit to grant and;

(v) grant the cost of this Original application.


2 When notice of the application was served on the respondents, they have filed a statement in which it is stated that the question raised in this application, challenge to the applications invited by the Department based on the condition for the post of Junior Telecom Officers relating to the marks prescribed for B.Sc. holders ^{has} been considered earlier in OA 149/90 and OA 470/90 which were dismissed.

In this view of the matter it is submitted by the learned counsel for the respondents that the present O.A. also deserves to be dismissed in the light of the decision.

3 The learned counsel for the applicant has nothing to say in regard to this statement.

4 In view of the averments made in the statement filed by the respondents, we are of the view that this matter has already been decided against the applicant and hence this application is dismissed.


(N Dharmadan) 15/1/91
Judicial Member


15/1/91
(NV Krishnan)
Administrative Member