

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A. 515/92

Monday, the sixth day of December, 1993

MR. N. DHARMADAN MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

MR. S. KASIPANDIAN MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

B.P. Sethumadhavan  
S/o Narayanan Panicker  
Padinjara Parambil House  
P.O. Karuvambram West  
Malappuram district

Applicant

By Advocate Mr. T. G. Rajendran (not present)

vs.

1. The Post Master General  
Northern Region, Calicut

2. Assistant Supdt. of Post Offices  
Manjeri Sub Division, Manjeri

Respondents

By Mr. T.P.M. Ibrahim Khan, ACGSC

ORDER

N. DHARMADAN

Applicant, who failed in the selection to the post of EDDA, Karuvambram West Post Office, filed this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals' Act for quashing the regular selection conducted pursuant to the direction of this Tribunal in O.A. 1633/91 Annexure-II.

2. The applicant has worked provisional in the same post office on the basis of Annexure-I order dated 21.8.91. When regular selection was initiated by the second respondent, apprehending termination and also denial of consideration, he filed earlier O.A. 1633/91. That was disposed of directing the respondents to consider the applicant also in the regular selection and terminate the service of the applicant in accordance with law in case he does not get selection. Thereafter, the respondents conducted interview in which the applicant was also considered; but the applicant was not selected. Under these circumstances, applicant filed the second original application.

3. Respondents in the reply stated that the selection was conducted strictly in accordance with the direction of this Tribunal and the selected candidate was found to be more meritorious and suitable for appointment than the applicant. The selected candidate secured 503 marks in the JTS examination which is equivalent to SSLC whereas the applicant got only 154 marks out of 600 in the SSLC.

4. The selection proceedings were also produced by the learned counsel for respondents. The statement of the respondents that the selected candidate is more meritorious and suitable than the applicant was not denied by the applicant by filing rejoinder. The applicant's claim is that he is entitled to weightage for the service in the same post office from the date of Annexure-II. It is submitted by the respondents that the selection was conducted strictly in accordance with the direction of this Tribunal in Annexure-II. They further submitted that the applicant would ~~xxx~~ have been selected but for the presence of more meritorious and suitable candidate than the applicant in the interview applying the criteria laid down by the Tribunal.

5. Having regardto the facts that the selection was conducted strictly in accordance with law bearing in mind the direction of this Tribunal in O.A. 1633/91, there is no substance in the original application; it is only to be rejected. Accordingly we dismiss the same.

6. There shall be no order as to costs.

  
(S. KASI PANDIAN)

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

kmm

  
(N. DHARMADHAN)

MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

6/12/93