

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA 610/2000

Wednesday the 7th day of June, 2000.

CORAM

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

P. Muniasamy  
S/o Late Patamasivan  
Extra Departmental Delivery Agent  
Wallardie, residing at 1st Division  
Wallardie Estate  
Vandiperiyar.

Applicant.

By advocate Mr P.Ramakrishnan

Versus

1. Union of India represented  
by the director General,  
Department of Posts, New Delhi.
2. The Sub Divisional Inspector,  
Office of the Sub Divisional Inspector,  
Peermade Postal Sub Division,  
Peermade-685 531.

Respondents

By Advocate Mrs. Rajeswari, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 7th June, 2000,  
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

Applicant who was engaged as Extra Departmental Delivery Agent, Wallardie Post Office with effect from 29.10.99 applied, pursuant to a notification, for a regular selection. Applicant was also called for an interview. Now alleging that while he was the only matriculate who took part in the interview, somebody else would be appointed, the applicant has filed this application seeking to have A-2 notification set aside as also to set aside all proceedings

initiated to make an appointment to the post of EDDA, Wallardie and for an order directing the second respondent to retain the applicant as EDDA, Wallardie till a regular selection and appointment is made. It is also alleged in the application that as the appointment is to be made provisionally towards a put off vacancy, there is no need to replace him by another provisional hand.

2. Having gone through the application and the annexures thereto, we do not find that that applicant has got a valid cause of action. The applicant who was engaged as a stop-gap arrangement has no right to challenge when a selection is being made for appointment either permanently or provisionally. The applicant who has applied pursuant to A2 notification having been called for interview and having participated, has no right to challenge the Annexure A2 notification.

3. The application, therefore, does not deserve to be admitted. Hence we reject the same under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals' Act of 1985.

No order as to cost.

Dated 7th June, 2000.



**G. RAMAKRISHNAN**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**



**A.V. HARIDASAN**  
**VICE CHAIRMAN**

aa.

Annexure referred to in this order :

A-2: True copy of Notice No.B2/157/Rectt.  
issued by the second respondent.

dated 7-4-2000