

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.591/2002.

Thursday this the 12th day of September 2002.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR.T.N.T.NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

C.T.Bindu, Examiner,
Custom House, Cochin.

Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Murali Purushothaman)

Vs.

1. Union of India, represented by
the Secretary to Government,
Department of Finance,
Central Government Secretariat,
New Delhi.

2. The Commissioner of Customs,
Custom House, No.33,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

3. The Commissioner of Customs,
Custom House, Cochin-9.

4. S.Anand Kumar Savalam,
Appraiser, Custom House,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

5. S.Dhanasekaran, Appraiser,
Custom House, Rajaji Salai,
Chennai-600 001. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri C.Rajendran, SCGSC (for R.1 to 3)

The application having been heard on 12th September, 2002, 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 is an Examiner, Custom House, Cochin has filed this application for a direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to review the regular and adhoc promotions made on the posts of Appraiser in the Custom House, Chennai, Cochin and Vizag on the basis of A-9 revised inter-se seniority list of Examiners.

[Handwritten signature/initials over the text]

2. It is alleged in the application that the respondents 4 and 5 who have become juniors to the applicant, by virtue of the revised seniority list A-7 and the Corrigendum A-9, having already been promoted to the post of Appraiser, the applicant's case for promotion is required to be considered. The applicant has made a representation (A8) in that regard to the 2nd respondent on 12.7.2002 which is to be considered and disposed of.

3. When the O.A. came up for hearing, learned counsel on either side agree that the said representation is a very recent one and it would be appropriate if the application is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider the applicant's representation and to give him an appropriate reply within a reasonable time.

4. In the light of the above submission made by the learned counsel on either side, without going into the merits of the case, we dispose of this application directing the 2nd respondent to consider A-8 representation of the applicant and to give her an appropriate reply within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 12th September 2002.


T.N.T. NAYAR
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER


A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

rv