

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.263/2000

Wednesday, this the 8th day of March, 2000.

CORAM:

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

HON'BLE MR G.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

G.Swarnamma,  
W/o Surendran,  
Part-time Contingent Sweeper,  
Medical College Post Office,  
Thiruvananthapuram.

- Applicant

By Advocate Mr G Sasidharan Chempazhanthiyil

Vs

1. Sub Postmaster,  
Medical College P.O.  
Thiruvananthapuram.
2. Senior Superintendent,  
North Postal Division,  
Thiruvananthapuram.
3. The Director of Post Service  
Headquarters,  
Office of the Chief Postmaster General,  
Kerala Circle,  
Thiruvananthapuram.
4. Director General,  
Postal Department,  
New Delhi.
5. Union of India represented by  
its Secretary,  
Ministry of Communication,  
New Delhi. - Respondents

By Advocate Mr M Rajendra Kumar, ACGSC

The application having been heard on 8.3.2000, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

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

The claim of the applicant, who is a part-time Sweeper-cum-Scavenger is that though she has been working for

.2..

more than nine hours a day, she is still treated as part-time worker and paid wages only accordingly. The applicant earlier approached this Tribunal by filing O.A 513/97 which was disposed of with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices to consider the representation submitted by the applicant after giving her an opportunity of personal hearing. After giving her the opportunity of personal hearing, the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, the second respondent passed an order dated 19.10.99 (Annexure A-2) by which the claim of the applicant for wages for full-time employment has been turned down. The applicant, thereafter made a representation to the third respondent claiming full time wages as also full time employment. That has not been considered and disposed of. The applicant has, therefore, filed this application seeking to have Annexure A-3 set aside, for a declaration that she is entitled to be given wages as a full time contingent employee and for a direction to the respondents to take action accordingly with consequential benefits.

2. When the application came up for hearing, learned counsel of the parties agreed that the application may be disposed of directing the applicant to make a more comprehensive representation to the third respondent highlighting her grievances and with a direction to the third respondent to dispose of the representation in accordance with law within a reasonable time.

3. In the light of the above submission made by the counsel on both sides, the application is disposed of

..3..

✓

directing the applicant to make a comprehensive representation to the third respondent with regard to her grievances within three weeks and with a direction to the third respondent that if such a representation is received within the said period, the same shall be considered and disposed of in the light of the rules and instructions on the subject and an appropriate reply shall be given to the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the representation.

4. There is no order as to costs.

Dated, the 8th of March, 2000.



G. RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

rv

LIST OF ANNEXURES REFERRED TO IN THE ORDER:

1. A-2: True copy of the Hearing Note submitted by the applicant before the 2nd respondent on 18.10.99.
2. A-3: True copy of the order No.A/15/XIX dated 19.10.99 issued by the 2nd respondent.