

# IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ERNAKULAM BENCH

O. A. No. 308/93 109

DATE OF DECISION 15-2-1993

P Suresh Kumar

Applicant (s)

Mr C Harikrishnan

Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus

The Superintendent of Post Offices

Mavelikkara Division

Respondent (s)

Mavelikkara and another.

Mr George CP Tharakan, SCGSC

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. AV Haridasan, Judicial Member  
and

The Hon'ble Mr. R Rangarajan, Administrative Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *No*
4. To be circulated to all Benches of the Tribunal? *No*

## JUDGEMENT

Shri AV Haridasan, J.M

The applicant who worked as substitute EDBPM, Neduvaramkode from 23.7.92 to 21.1.93 and thereafter as provisional from 3.1.93 has sought a declaration that he is entitled to be selected as EDBPM, Neduvaramkode and for direction to Respondent-1 to appoint him to that post on regular basis. It has been averred in the application that for the purpose of filling up the vacancy on regular basis, the respondents have conducted an interview on 11.2.93 in which the applicant alongwith four other persons sponsored by the Employment Exchange were considered. It is allegedly


coming to know from some 'reliable source' that the Respondent-1 is going to oust the applicant from service, the applicant has filed this application for a declaration that he is entitled to be selected for appointment as EDBPM and for direction to appoint him in that post.

2        There is no right for the applicant to be selected and appointed on any post. The right if at all is only to be considered for selection alongwith other suitable and eligible candidates. It is for the appointing authority to make a selection and to appoint the most eligible and suitable candidate. The applicant is not therefore entitled for a declaration that he is entitled to be selected and appointed.

3        In view of what is stated above, we do not find any merit in this application and therefore, reject the same under Section 19(iii) of the Administrative Tribunals Act of 1985.

4        There will be no order as to costs.

  
(R Rangarajan)  
Administrative Member

  
(AV Haridasan)  
Judicial Member

15-2-1993