

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.88/13

Thursday this the 1st day of August 2013

C O R A M :

HON'BLE Mr.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

P.R.Jaya,
W/o.Omanakuttan,
Reservation Supervisor Grade-II,
Southern Railway, Thalassery.
Residing at Vettathuparamabil, Athaniparambu,
Kallekulangara, Palakkad.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.O.D.Sivadas)

V e r s u s

1. The General Manager,
Southern Railways, Chennai.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Palakkad Division, Southern Railway,
Palakkad – 678 001.
3. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
Palakkad Division, Southern Railway,
Palakkad – 678 001.
4. The Divisional Commercial Manager,
Palakkad Division, Southern Railway,
Palakkad – 678 001.

...Respondents


(By Advocate Mr.Thomas Mathew Nellimoottil)

This application having been heard on 1st August 2013 this Tribunal
on the same day delivered the following :-

ORDER

HON'BLE Mr.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

This O.A has been filed by the applicant impugning Annexure A-5
order No.J/P/OA.806/2012 dated 15.11.2012 wherein it has been stated



.2.

that it is not possible to consider her request for transfer to Ottappalam or Shoranur in Palakkad Division at present. However, along with the reply statement filed by the respondents on 7.6.2013, they have annexed a copy of their order Annexure R-5 No.J/P.535/II/CS&ER/Vo..I dated 20.5.2013 transferring her from Thalassery and posting at Palakkad. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that inspite of the aforesaid order passed way back on 20.5.2013, the applicant has not been relieved so far. He has, therefore, submitted that the aforesaid order has been issued only to circumvent the interim order of this Tribunal dated 4.2.2013 in this O.A directing the respondents not to fill up one vacancy of RS-II at Palakkad till the next date of hearing. Counsel for the respondents, on instruction, has, however, submitted that the aforesaid order will be implemented shortly. Counsel for the applicant accused that the aforesaid submission of the counsel for the respondents is quite vague so long as there is no time limit for implementing the aforesaid order. He has, therefore, insisted that the aforesaid order be implemented within a week's time and the applicant shall be relieved from her present place of posting to join at Palakkad.

2. I have heard counsel for the parties. I agree with the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant. It is quite surprising that the aforesaid order dated 20.5.2013 has not so far been implemented. In my considered view the respondents can also not be evasive by saying that the order will be implemented shortly. I, therefore, direct the respondents that they shall implement their order dated 20.5.2013 without



.3.

any delay and in any case before 14.8.2013 by relieving the applicant from the present post and allowing her to join the post at Palakkad. A copy of this order be handed over to the counsel for the parties for implementation of this order. The O.A is disposed of accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Dated this the 1st day of August 2013)



GEORGE PARACKEN
JUDICIAL MEMBER

asp