

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A. No. 540 of 1996.

Tuesday this the 7th day of May 1996.

HON'BLE MR. P.V. VENKATAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

V.K. Velayudhan,
Junior Engineer-I/
Special Works,
Southern Railway,
Ernakulam Junction, .. Applicant

(By Advocate Shri T.C. Govinda Swamy)

Vs.

1. Union of India through
the Secretary to the
Government of India,
Ministry of Railways,
Rail Bhavan,
New Delhi.

2. The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Headquarters Office,
Park Town P.O.,
Madras-3.

3. The Chief Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway,
Headquarters Office,
Park Town P.O.,
Madras-3. .. Respondents

(By Advocate Smt. Sumathi Dandapani)

The application having been heard on 7th May, 1996,
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

Applicant, who is a Junior Engineer, Southern Railway, is aggrieved by A1 letter dated 9.4.96 in which certain employees have been directed for medical examination

pending consideration for promotion to Group 'B' services in Civil Engineering Department on ad hoc basis. Applicant contends that he is senior to the persons listed in A1 and therefore, his exclusion from this list is irregular.

2. Learned counsel for respondents states that the proposed promotion has already been effected by orders dated 13.4.96 and that applicant was not considered on the basis of certain adverse entries in his confidential report.

3. Applicant has made a representation A2 to the 2nd respondent. Learned counsel for respondents submitted that this representation would be considered and disposed of expeditiously.

4. Accordingly, I direct second respondent to consider A2 on merits, pass appropriate speaking orders and communicate the same to applicant within one month.

5. Application is disposed of as aforesaid. No costs.

Tuesday this the 7th day of May 1996.


P.V. VENKATAKRISHNAN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

rv7/5

List of Annexures

1. Annexure A1: A true copy of the letter No.P(G)543/1/GR"8" of 9/4/96 issued by the 3rd respondent.
2. Annexure A2: A true copy of the representation dated 16/4/96 submitted by the applicant to the second respondent.