

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM EBNCH**

**O.A. No. 476 OF 2007**

Friday, this the 28th day of September, 2007.

**CORAM :**

**HON'BLE Mrs. SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE Mr. GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**K.R. Rajesh Kumar  
Kunjukattu House,  
Panachippara, Poonjar PO,  
Kottayam**

**: Applicant**

**(By Advocate Mr.P.R.Padmanabhan Niar )**

**Versus**

- 1. Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices  
Kottayam Division, Kottayam - 1**
- 2. Inspector of Post Offices  
Pala Sub Division, Pala**
- 3. Postmaster General  
Central Region, Kochi - 682016**
- 4. Chief Postmaster General  
Kerala Circle,  
Thiruvananthapuram - 695 001**

**: Respondents**

**(By Advocate Mr. TPM Ibrahim Khan, SCGSC )**

The application having been heard on 28.09.2007, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :

**O R D E R**

**HON'BLE Mrs. SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN**

The applicant has approached this Tribunal through this OA for a direction to consider him for appointment to the post of Gramin Dak Sevak BPM, alongwith other candidates who were called for the interview held on 12.07.2007 and to declare that the exclusion of the applicant from amongst the candidates called for the interview is illegal.

2. The respondents invited applications from eligible candidates vide memo dated 10.04.2007. and the applicant has submitted his application allegedly on 01.05.2007. The qualification for the post is SSLC and the applicant submits that he is well qualified for the post. When the matter came up on 06.08.2007, the respondents were directed by this Tribunal not to make any appointment till the next date of hearing.

3. Reply statement was filed by the respondents stating that Seventeen applications were received from Open market and Employment Exchange also nominated four candidates. Among those applications, two applications including that of the applicant could not be considered since the copies of the mark list of SSLC were not enclosed alongwith their applications. The application was therefore defective and could not be considered. Six candidates who secured highest marks in SSLC were short listed and were called for interview on 12.07.2007. It is now submitted that as per Annexure A-3 now furnished by the applicant, it is seen that he has secured only 258 marks while selected candidate was having 528 marks. As such, even if the copy of the mark list of SSLC had been enclosed, he could not have come in the merit for selection.

4. In the light of the facts brought out by the respondents, this O.A has no merit and is dismissed. No costs.

Dated, the 28<sup>th</sup> September, 2007.

  
**GEORGE PARACKEN**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

  
**SATHI NAIR**  
**VICE CHAIRMAN**

vs