

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH  
O.A.No.507/2005.**

Thursday this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of June 2005.

**CORAM:**

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

C.S.Sudhirkumar,  
Station Master Gr.III,  
Southern Railway, Ernakulam West ('C' Cabin),  
residing at Railway Quarters No.20,  
Idapilly, R.S. Kochi-26. Applicant

**(By Advocate Shri G.Sreekumar)**

Vs.

1. Union of India, represented by the General Manager, Southern Railway, Park Town, Chennai, Pin-600 003.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Southern Railway, Thycaud, Trivandrum-14.
3. Senior Divisional Operations Manager, Southern Railway, Thycaud, Trivandrum-14.
4. C.Balachandran, Senior Divisional Operations Manager, Office of the Senior Divisional Operations Manager, Southern Railway, Thycaud, Trivandrum-14.

(By Advocate Shri K.M.Anthru)

The application having been heard on 30.6.05  
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

**ORDER**

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

The applicant is a Station Master in Southern Railway, working at Ernakulam 'C' Cabin. He was put off duty on 11.5.2005 against which he approached this Tribunal in O.A.382/05, which is pending. The grievance of the applicant is that, he was deputed for a Refresher Course in Tiruchirappilly from 6.6.05 to 10.6.05 after being admitted to duty and on his return, again he has been asked to go for a Special Refresher Course by order at A-3. According to the applicant the refresher Course that now he is deputed for is premature, as his Competency Certificate is valid upto February 2006.

2. When the matter came up before the Bench, Shri G Sreekumar, learned counsel appeared for the applicant and Shri K.M. Anthru, learned counsel appeared for the respondents.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that he has no objection to attend the Course on Safety whenever it is due and learned counsel for the respondents stated that such courses/being held at Tiruchirappally, whenever new equipments were introduced and batches of Station Masters have been deputed and the applicant is not singled out.
4. I find that the impugned order at A-3 does not give any details about its duration and it is not a properly worded order. It only appears to be a part of a noting in the file. The applicant has made a representation on 11.6.05 which has not been taken into consideration so far.
5. In the circumstance I am of the view that, the impugned order at A-3 should be kept in abeyance for the time being.
6. The applicant is directed to make a fresh representation explaining his grievance and the circumstance under which he is unable to attend the Special Refresher Course as ordered within a week, and the respondents are directed to consider such representation within a week and pass orders to be communicated to the applicant within three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
7. O.A. is disposed of as above. No costs.

Dated the 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2005.

*Sathi Nair*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SATHI NAIR  
VICE CHAIRMAN