

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA 476/99

Tuesday the 25th day of May 1999.

CORAM

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

T.A.Vijayamma
Assistant Superintendent, RMS 2(a)
Railway Mail Service, Thiruvalla. ...Applicant.
(By advocate Mr R. Rajasekharan Pillai)

Versus

1. The Union of India represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Communications, Dept. of Posts, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Postmaster General Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. The Assistant Director(Staff) Office of the Chief Postmaster General Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram. ...Respondents.
4. Shajan David, IRM, RMS EK Division, Ernakulam.
5. Thomas Jacob, ASRM Thiruvalla RMS 2/B

(By advocate Mr Govind K.Bharathan, SCGSC)
Mr P.C.Sebastian for R4&5)

The application having been heard on 25th May 1999, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

The applicant presently working as Assistant Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, Thiruvalla is aggrieved that she has been superseded in the matter of promotion to the post of Assistant Superintendent of Railway Mail Service. Therefore, she has filed this application impugning the order by which respondents 4 & 5 were promoted to that post.

2. Respondents 4 & 5 have filed separate reply statements opposing the grant of reliefs. The 4th respondent contends that he has been promoted against the backlog vacancy of reserved Scheduled Tribe quota. The 5th respondent

contends that he being the senior most was promoted against an unreserved vacancy. Respondents 1 to 3 have not filed any reply statement.

3. When the matter came up today, learned counsel of the applicant stated that against the impugned order of promotion by which the applicant has been superseded, the applicant has filed an appeal to the second respondent on 12.5.99. The counsel pleaded that the original application may be disposed of with a direction to the second respondent to dispose of the appeal at the earliest. Learned counsel for the respondents also stated that the application may be disposed of with appropriate directions to the second respondent to dispose of the appeal at the earliest possible.

4. In the light of the above submissions by the learned counsel on either side, this application is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the appeal filed by the applicant on 12.5.99 in accordance with the rules and instructions on the subject and to give the applicant an appropriate speaking order within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

Dated 25th May 1999.



(A.V. HARIDASAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

aa.

Annexures referred to in the order:

A-IV: True copy of the order No.ST/18-2/97 dtd. 16.4.99.