

Date of Decision: 18.9.1989.

Central Administrative Tribunal
Ernakulam Bench

D.A. 456/89

V.V.Appakutty & 6 others Vs. Secretary M/o Defence & others

D.A. 494/89

K.R.Chenthamarakshan & Others Vs. Secretary, M/o Defence and others

D.A. 498/89

T.K.Sugathan and others Vs. Secretary, M/o Defence & Others

CORAM

Hon'ble Shri S.P.Mukerji, Vice Chairman

&

Hon'ble Shri A.V.Haridasan, Judicial Member

Counsel for the applicants .. M/s Govinda Bharathan and Srihari Rao.

Counsel for the respondents .. Mr. P.V.Madhavan Nambiar, SCGSC

ORDER

(Shri S.P.Mukerji, Vice Chairman)

Heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

The main grievance of the applicants is that the persons ^{junior} who should have ^{been} below them in the All India Seniority List of Superintendents (Buildings and Roads) Grade I have been included in the panel for promotion as Assistant Engineer whereas their names have not been included. The learned counsel for the respondents states that no one junior to the applicants in the All India Seniority List has been empanelled. The learned counsel for the applicants states that the All India Seniority List had never been circulated inviting objections and the list that was circulated so far as the applicants are concerned was a truncated All India Seniority List as at Annexure A.3 and the applicants had no opportunity to contest the seniority assigned to them in the All India Seniority List.

2. In view of the above facts, we close these applications with the direction to the applicants that they should file a representation against their seniority in the All India Seniority List within one month from today and the respondents are directed to dispose of these representations in accordance with law, within two months from the date of receipt of the representations. The applicants will be at liberty to approach appropriate legal forum if they are aggrieved by the outcome of their representations.


(A.V. Haridasan)
Judicial Member


S.P. Mukerji
Vice Chairman

18.9.89

Sn.