

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.220/08

Friday this the 25th day of April 2008

C O R A M :

HON'BLE Mr.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

N.Ramachandra Sarma,
Postal Assistant,
Willington Island,
Ernakulam Division, Kochi – 3.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.S.M.Prem)

Versus

1. Union of India represented
by Secretary to Government,
Department of Posts, New Delhi.

2. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Ernakulam Division, Kochi – 11.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.P.S.Biju,ACGSC)

This application having been heard on 25th April 2008 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :-

ORDER

HON'BLE Mr.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

The applicant is presently working as Postal Assistant in the Willington Island Post Office. He is aggrieved by Annexure A-1 impugned order dated 1.4.2008 by which he has been transferred to Kochi Head Post Office. The applicant submitted that earlier he had made Annexure A-2 representation dated 9.1.2008 giving option for his transfer and posting to Matsyapuri Post Office, Mundamveli Post Office, Palluruthi Post Office and Mattancheri Town Post Office. Counsel for the applicant submitted that till his option is considered, the applicant should not have been transferred.



.2.

2. It is seen that the aforesaid Annexure A-2 representation was made on 9.1.2008 and the impugned transfer order was issued on 1.4.2008. It cannot be said that the respondents were not aware of the aforesaid Annexure A-2 option. Moreover, the applicant has not shown any order/rule by which he could give such an option for a transfer and posting to a Post Office of his choice. The reasons given by the applicant to challenge his transfer order was that he is a resident of Chottanikkara, his children are studying in Kendriya Vidyalaya Port Trust School, Kochi and that his wife is also employed in Rubber Board Office, Willington Island and he will have to board two buses to reach the place where he has been transferred now. In my considered opinion none of the above reasons are good enough reasons for this Tribunal to interfere with the transfer order issued to the applicant along with 16 other persons. In the above facts and circumstances of the case, the O.A is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Dated this the 25th day of April 2008)


GEORGE PARACKEN
JUDICIAL MEMBER

asp