

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 463 of 2004

Wednesday, this the 4th day of August, 2004

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. H.P. DAS, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. R. Sasidharan Pillai,  
GDS Mail Carrier,  
Valavupacha Branch Post Office,  
Chithara, Quilon District. ....Applicant

[By Advocate Shri Thomas Mathew]

Versus

1. Sub Divisional Inspector of Post Offices,  
Kottarakkara.

2. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Kollam Division, Kollam.

3. Chief Postmaster General,  
Kerala Circle, Trivandrum.

4. Union of India, represented by its  
Secretary, Department of Posts,  
New Delhi. ....Respondents

[By Advocate Shri C. Rajendran, SCGSC]

The application having been heard on 4-8-2004, the  
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

The grievance of the applicant, GDS Mail Carrier,  
Valavupacha Branch Post Office, is that the respondents have  
without any notice issued Annexure A2 order dated 16-6-2004  
abolishing the post of GDSMC Valavupacha BO and redesignating  
the post as GDSMP/MC in the higher TRCA and calling upon him to  
take over charge as on 17-6-2004. It is alleged in the  
application that by combining the work of GDSMC and GDSMP the

..2..

working hours would be increased beyond 5 hours, which is not permissible as per the guidelines and, therefore, the impugned order Annexure A2 is liable to be set aside.

2. Taking notice on behalf of the respondents, Shri C.Rajendran, learned SCGSC has filed a statement. The action taken is sought to be justified on the ground that under instructions from the 3rd respondent a decision was taken to combine the work of GDSMC and GDSMP Valavupacha BO in terms of the policy of the department and the total work hours after combination of duties of the two posts is only 4 hours and 33 minutes within the permissible limit.

3. We find that the action taken by the respondents in abolishing the post of GDSMC and creating the post of GDSMP combined with higher TRCA is well in accordance with the instructions on the subject and within the permissible limit which does not call for any intervention. The Original Application is, therefore, rejected under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. No costs.

Wednesday, this the 4th day of August, 2004

12.6.2004

H.P. DAS  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

Ak.