

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A. NO. 72/93

Tuesday, this the 18th day of January, 1994

SHRI N. DHARMADAN, MEMBER (J)
SHRI S.KASIPANDIAN, MEMBER(A)

1. K.K.Omana,
Supervisor, Savings Bank
Control Organisation,
Thycaud Head Post Office,
2. K.Viswanathan, Supervisor,
Savings Bank Control Organisation,
Thiruvananthapuram G.P.O. .. Applicants.

By Advocate Shri G.Sasidharan Chempazhanthiyil.

V/s

1. The Director of Postal Services (HQ),
Thiruvananthapuram.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. The Director General,
Postal Department, New Delhi.
4. Union of India, rep. by its
Secretary, Min. of Communications,
New Delhi.
5. Smt. K.Chinnammu,
Supervisor, SBCO, Manjeri.
6. P.M.Subramonian,
Supervisor, SBCO, Trichur.
7. R.Ramakrishnan,
Supervisor, SBCO, Alwaye.
8. V.P.Nataraja Panicker,
Supervisor, SBCO, Alleppy.
9. K.Raghavan,
Supervisor, SBCO, Badagara.
10. Peter Bennis,
Supervisor, SBCO, Cannanore. .. Respondents

By Advocate Shri S.Krishnamoorthy, ACGSC (Res. 1 to 4)

ORDER

N.DHARMADAN

Applicants are Supervisors working in the Savings
Bank Control Organisation (SBCO) Workshop. They are in the

Lower Selection Grade drawing a scale of Rs.1400-2300. According to the applicants, they were directly recruited as UDCs in the year 1968. Respondents 5 to 10 were only working as LDCs at the time of the recruitment of the applicants and they are juniors to the applicants. But on account of the grant of second promotion as per the BCR Scheme, they happened to be posted as HSG above the applicants. The submission of the applicants is that they are entitled to the promotion, but the applicants cannot be deprived of the supervisory power on account of the implementation of the scheme and promotion of them.

2. According to the applicants, this case is covered by the decision of this Tribunal in A.Damodaran & Another vs. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Trichur Division, Trichur & Others, O.A.880/93 and connected cases and O.A. 7/93. The learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the applicants are proposing to file a detailed representation before the 4th respondent for getting the benefit of the judgment. The learned counsel further submitted that this application can be disposed of permitting the applicants to file a detailed representation before the 4th respondent in this behalf.

3. The learned counsel for the respondents was also heard. On the facts and circumstances of this case, the submissions made at the Bar cannot be objected to by the learned counsel. Having regard to the facts, we are satisfied that the above proposal made by the learned counsel for the applicants can be granted in the interest of justice.

4. Accordingly, we dispose of the application directing the applicants to file representation either jointly or individually before the 4th respondent for granting the benefit of the judgment referred to above. This shall be filed within three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. If the 4th respondent receives such representation/representations, he shall consider and dispose of the same in accordance with law within a period of four months from the date of receipt of the representation bearing in mind the principles in the decision of this Tribunal referred to above. Till the compliance of the directions and disposal of the representations, the interim order passed on 12.1.93 shall be in force.

5. The original application is disposed of as above. There will be no order as to costs.



(S.KASIPANDIAN)
MEMBER(A)


18.1.94

(N.DHARMADAN)
MEMBER(J)

v/-