

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.461/2000

Wednesday this the 31st day of May, 2000

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. G. RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. K.K.Krishnan, aged 41 years  
S/o Kuttan, Postman,  
Kunnamkulam Head Post office,  
residing at Kallilumbil House,  
Kallumpuram,  
PO.Kadavallur.
2. P.V.Jayaprakasan, aged 44 years  
S/o P.P.Velu Postman,  
Parappur residing at  
Purathala House,  
Kadabankadu, Trichur Dist.

...Applicants

(By Advocate Mr. P. Ramakrishnan)

Vs.

1. Union of India, represented by the  
Director General,  
Department of Posts,  
New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General,  
Central Region,  
Ernakulam.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Post  
Offices, Trichur Division, Trichur.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mrs. S.Chitra (represented))

The application having been heard on 31.5.2000, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicants two in number who participated in the Departmental Examination for promotion as Postal Assistants are aggrieved that while they had qualified in Papers I and III, they did not get the qualifying marks in Paper No.II. Aggrieved and feeling that there must have been some mistake in totalling, the applicants requested for retotalling. By the order A4 they were informed that on retotalling the marks were found to be correct. The applicants are still further aggrieved because according to

them they found the Paper No.II easier than Papers I and III and therefore they could have ~~been~~ got more marks in Paper II. Therefore, they have prayed that the respondents may be directed to have the paper No.II revalued.

2. On a careful scrutiny of the application and the materials placed on record and on hearing the learned counsel on either side, we do not find any legitimate cause of action of the applicants which calls for adjudication. Mere wishful thinking that the applicants have done well in Paper II and that they would be entitled to get more marks would not give rise to any valid cause of action. As there is no provision for revaluation in the rules, we do not find any basis in the applicants' claim in this application. Further in the A4 letter the Chief Post Master General has stated that each answers of the applicants have been valued and marks awarded and that the same has been verified and found correct.

3. In the circumstances stated above, the application is rejected under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 31st day of May, 2000



G. RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

List of annexure referred to:

S.

Annexure.A4: True copy of letter No.B2/Rectt/Psotman/99 dated 12.4.99 issued by the third respondent.

...