

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA 163/99

Friday the 19th day of February 1999.

CORAM

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

Yamuna P.G.
Pulikkathara House
Kathrikkadavu
P.O.Kaloor, Kochi - 17.

...Applicant

(By advocate Mr Cyriac Thomas)

Versus

1. The Postmaster General
Central Region, Ernakulam
Cochin-16.

2. The Sub Divisional Inspector of Post Office
Trippunithura Sub Division
Trippunithura.

...Respondents.

(By advocate Ms Sheela Devi, ACGSC)

The application having been heard on 19th February 1999,
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

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

Applicant has filed this application for a direction
to second respondent to consider the candidature of the
applicant also for selection and appointment to the post of
Extra Departmental Delivery Agent, Mamala Post Office along
with other candidates sponsored by the employment exchange ,
in the interview to be held on 8.2.99 at 3 P.M.

2. When the application came up on 8.2.99, it was directed
that any action taken with regard to the selection should be
subject to further directions to be given by the Tribunal.

3. When the application came up today for hearing, Additional
Central Govt. Standing Counsel appearing for respondents stated
that the interview held on 8.2.99 was not for a fresh selection
but was for re-doing an earlier selection which was held on
6.4.98 in obedience to the directions of the Tribunal in its
order in OA 877/98 which was confirmed by the order of the
Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in O.P. 14775/98 and, therefore,

the question of consideration of any candidate other than those who participated in the earlier selection does not arise.

4. In as much as the interview held on 8.2.99 was in conformity with the directions of the Tribunal and the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala to consider the original applicant in OA 877/98 giving him the weightage for his provisional service, the respondents could not have considered any candidate who had not participated in the original selection. The applicant is, therefore, not entitled to any relief and does not have a valid cause of action. Application is, therefore, rejected under Section 19 (3) of the Tribunals Act. There is no order as to costs.

Dated 19th February 1999.



(A.V. HARIDASAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

aa.