

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.601/99

Wednesday this the 16th day of June, 1999

CORAM

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

T.Sukumaran,  
Extra Departmental Mail Carrier, II  
Kadalundynagaram Sub Office,  
Tirur.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. O.V.Radhakrishnan)

Vs.

1. The Assistant Superintendent of  
Post Offices, Tirur Sub Division,  
Tirur.
2. G.K.Sasikuamr,  
Shobha Nivas,  
Parappanangadi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Rajeswari.A, ACGSC for R.1)

The application having been heard on 16.6.99, 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 presently working as  
Extra Departmental Mail Carrier II, Kadalundynagaram Sub  
Office is aggrieved that he has been served with an order  
dated 28.5.99 (A6) informing him that his services as  
provisional E.D.Agent would be terminated with effect  
from 4.6.99 as another candidate Shri G.Sasikumar had  
been provisionally selected to be appointed with effect  
from that date. He is also aggrieved by the appointment  
order issued to Shri G.K.Sasikumar on 28.5.99 (A7). It  
is alleged in the application that when O.A. 1014/98  
filed by the applicant taken up for hearing, on behalf of  
the first respondent it was submitted that there is no

...2

.2.

proposal to replace the applicant by another provisional hand till a regular selection to the post is made and that the present action is without regard to the undertaking given by the respondent before the Tribunal. Therefore, the applicant has prayed that the impugned orders A6 and A7 be set aside.

2. Today when the application came up for hearing, Smt. Rajeswari.A. Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent under instructions from the official respondent states that the impugned appointment order and the termination order A7 and A6 respectively were issued as the official respondent did not come to know of the order passed by the Tribunal on 17.8.98 in O.A.1014/98 and that in view of the undertaking given on behalf of the respondent in that case, the respondent would recall the A6 and A7 orders and would not terminate the services of the applicant for the purpose of appointment of another provisional hand. It is also stated that until a regular selection is made the services of the applicant shall not be terminated.

3. Taking note of the above submission of the learned counsel for the first respondent, the application is closed without any further direction. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 16th day of June, 1999



G. RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

|ks/

List of annexures referred to in the order:

- Annexure.A6: True copy of the Memo No.MC-II-SO-6 dated 28.5.99 of the 1st respondent.  
Annexure A7: True copy of the Memo No.MC-II/SO-6 dated 28.5.99 of the 1st respondent.

...