

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.582/2000

Monday this the 5th day of June, 2000

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. G. RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

V.Sivasankaran, Workmistry,
Office of the Executive Engineer,
(Construction), Southern Railway,
Podanur.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. T.A Rajan)

Vs.

1. Union of India, represented by the
General Manager,
Southern Railway, Headquarters Office,
Park Town PO, Madras.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
southern Railway,
Headquarters Office,
Park Town PO, Madras.3.
3. The Chief Project Manager,
Construction Office,
Southern Railway,
Egmore, Chennai.
4. The Senior Personnel Officer,
(Construction), Southern Railway,
Madras.
5. The Senior Divisional Personnel officer,
Southern Railway,
Palakkad division,
Palakkad.
6. The Executive Engineer (Construction)
Southern Railway, Podanur.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.K. Karthikeya Panicker)

The application having been heard on 5.6.2000, the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

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

The applicant, presently posted at Podanur within
the territorial limits of the Madras Bench of the Central
Administrative Tribunal has filed this application
impugning Annexure.A5 order dated 11.4.2000 by which he
was ordered to be reverted to the post of Mate. The order
was issued by the Chief Project Manager/GC, Chennai and
the applicant has been described as Supervisor/Works

(adhoc), XEN//CN/PTJ. The applicant states that since the reversion order was received by him at Palghat where he was residing, this Bench of the Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain this application.

2. According to the provisions contained in Rule 6 of the C.A.T. (Procedure) Rules normally an application can be filed by a serving employee in the Bench which has got jurisdiction over the area where he is posted or where cause of action either in whole or in part arose. In this case the applicant for the time being was posted in Podanur within the territorial limits of the Madras Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal and the impugned order was issued by the Chief Project Manager, Chennai and addressed to the applicant as Supervisor, Works (adhoc), Podanur Junction. The applicant was not posted within the territorial limits of this Bench. No part of the cause of action also has arisen in Palghat. The learned counsel of the applicant states that as the impugned order was served on the applicant at Palghat which place is within the territorial limits of this Bench cause of action has arisen at Palghat and therefore, this Bench has jurisdiction. We do not agree. If such a view is taken an employee can choose the Bench he wants by going to the territorial area of that Bench and getting the order served there. We find that this Bench of the Tribunal does not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain this application and therefore, we reject the application. The applicant will be at liberty to move the appropriate Bench for relief.

Dated the 5th day of June, 2000



G. RAMAKRISHNAN
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN