

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.NO.72/2002

Tuesday, this the 5th day of February, 2002.

CORAM;

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

HON'BLE MR T.N.T.NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Leena P.Varghese,  
Postal Assistant,  
Tirur.

- Applicant

By Advocate Mr P.I.Georgekutty

Vs

1. Union of India represented by its  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Communications,  
New Delhi.

2. The Chief Post Master General,  
Kerala Circle,  
Thiruvananthapuram.

3. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Pathanamthitta Division,  
Pathanamthitta.

4. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Tirur Division,  
Tirur.

- Respondents

By Advocate Mr C Rajendran, SCGSC

The application having been heard on 5.2.2002 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

The applicant, working as a Postal Assistant at Tirur Division from 21.8.96 onwards, submitted a representation to the respondents for a transfer to any place nearer to Pandalam

67

which is her native place as her husband who was employed at Tirur and living with her left India on employment abroad. The request of the applicant for transfer under Rule 38 was considered and the third respondent by a communication dated 30.12.99 (A-1) ordered the transfer of the applicant to Punaloor with the approval of the Chief PMG, Kerala Circle. However, she has not been given a posting even after a lapse of more than a year. Applicant, therefore, made a representation on 23.7.2001 to the second respondent requesting that necessary orders be issued allowing her to join at Punaloor. In the representation she explained her difficult situation indicating that she was pregnant and has no one there to take care of her. Despite this representation made, the applicant has not been given a posting nor is there any response thereto. Under these circumstances, the applicant has filed this application for the following reliefs:

(a) Direct the 4th respondent to issue necessary reliving order to the applicant without any further delay.

(b) To direct the respondents 2 to 4 to effect Annexure-A1, the applicants transfer order expeditiously.

2. When the application came up for hearing, the learned SCGSC took notice on behalf of the respondents. The learned counsel on either side agreed that the application may be disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the case of the applicant and to give her an appropriate reply.

3. In the light of the above submission made by the learned counsel on either side, we dispose of this application directing the second respondent to look into the matter with deserving sympathy taking into account the fact that the applicant's husband is away and she is alone at Tirur and other relevant facts and circumstances and to give the applicant an appropriate reply as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. There is no order as to costs.

Dated, the 5th February, 2002.

  
T.N.T. NAYAR  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

  
A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

trs

APPENDIX

**Applicant's Annexure:**

1. A-1 : True copy of the memo No.8/39/TFR issued by the 3rd respondent dated 30.12.1999.
2. A-2 : True copy of the representation issued to the 2nd respondent by the applicant dated 23.7.2001.

\*\*\*\*\*

npp  
12.2.02