

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No. 479/2000

Friday this the 28th day of April, 2000

CORAM

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

Indira Haridas
Head Clerk
Office of Senior Section Engineer/Tele/
Division, Southern Railway,
Palakkad.Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. TA Rajan)

vs.

1. Union of India, represented by the General Manager, Southern Railway, Chennai.3.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Southern Railway, Palakkad.
3. The Senior Divisional Signal and Telecommunciation Engineer, Southern Railway, Palakkad.Respondents

(By Advocate Mrs. Sumati Dandapani (rep. by Ms. Sabana)

The application having been heard on 28.4.2000, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

The applicant who has been working under the Section Engineers for the last seventeen years in the clerical cadre and is presently posted as Head Clerk in the office of the Senior Secion Engineer/Tle.Division, Southern Railway is aggrieved that she is not being considered for a posting in the administrative office ie., under the third respondent in spite of the guidelines for rotational posting. Aggrieved of this the applicant had made representations but without success. The later representations made by the applicant are dated 21.1.2000 and 16.3.2000 respectively (Annexures.A2 and A3). Since there is no response to

the representations the applicant has filed this application for a declaration that non-consideration of the applicant for a posting in the office of the third respondent is illegal, that she is eligible and entitled to be posted in the office of the third respondent in view of the guidelines contained in the order of the Railway Board dated 21.9.94 (Annexure.4) and for a direction to the respondents to consider and post the applicant in the office of the third respondent and also to direct the respondents 2&3 to consider and dispose of Annexures A1 to A3 representations.

2. When the application came up for hearing, Smt. Sumati Dandapani took notice on behalf of the respondents. Counsel appearing on her behalf submits that the application may be disposed of with a direction to the second respondent to consider the applicant's representations A2 and A3 and pass appropriate orders within a reasonable period. The counsel for applicant states that the applicant would be satisfied if the application is disposed of as suggested by the learned counsel for the respondents.

3. In the light of the submission of the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the A2 and A3 representations made by the applicant and to give her an appropriate reply within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Dated the 28th day of April, 2000.


A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

S.

.3.

List of Annexures referred to:

Annexure.A1:True copy of applicant's representation dated 31.7.98 addressed to the third respondent.

Annexure.A2:True copy of applicant's representation dated 21.1.2000 addressed to the 2nd respondent.

Annexure.A3:True copy of applicant's representation dated 16.3.2000 addressed to the 2nd respondent.

Annexure.A4:True copy of Railway Board order No.E(NG)I/93/TR/24 dated 21.9.1994.

• • •