

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.76/2006

Tuesday this the 14th day of February 2006.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MRS. SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

A.B.Pushpavally, W/o Sebastian,
Gramin Dak Sevak Branch Postmaster Vempally P.O.,
Residing at Ariyapurath House,
Vempally P.O., Kuravilangad, Kottayam. Applicant

(By Advocate Shri PC Sebastian)

Vs.

1. The Sub Divisional Inspector of Post Offices,
Vaikom Sub Division, Vaikom – 686 141.
2. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Kottayam Division, Kottayam-686001.
3. The Postmaster General,
Central Region, Kochi – 682018.
4. The Union of India, represented by
Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Communications,
Department of Posts, New Delhi. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil)

The Application having been heard on 14.2.2006
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following

ORDER

HON'BLE MRS. SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant who is presently working as GDS Branch Postmaster was selected and appointed w.e.f.6.7.95 vide order dated 18.7.05 and is continuing as such.

2. When the matter came up before the Bench, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that, by impugned order dated 27.1.2006, the applicant is compelled to do the work of Mail Carrier also without any remuneration. According to the applicant she is not bound to do so. The applicant is aggrieved by the memo dated 6.2.2006 issued by the 1st

respondent purportedly in pursuance of the order of the 2nd respondent dated 27.1.06 which violates the provisions under Article 43 of the Constitution. The counsel for the applicant is not able to bring to our notice any order violating the rules/guidelines in this regard.

3. Shri Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil took notice for the respondents and contended that the applicant is bound to do the work of GDS Mail Carrier also.

4. Heard the counsel on both sides. We find that the applicant has not approached the departmental authorities concerned for the redressal of her grievance. She should have availed of the departmental remedy available before approaching the Tribunal. Hence, the application is premature and the same is dismissed. No costs.

Dated the 14th February, 2006.


GEORGE PARACKEN
JUDICIAL MEMBER


SATHI NAIR
VICE CHAIRMAN