

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH  
\*\*\*\*\*

OA 311/2002

Friday, this the 3rd day of May, 2002.

CORAM :

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

Rajeswari Amma,  
Aged 40 years, W/o Vijayakumar,  
Postal Assistant,  
Changalam P.O.,  
residing at 'Nandanam',  
Anikad West.

... Applicant

( By Advocate Mr. P. Ramakrishnan )

Vs

1. The Superintendant of Post Offices,  
Changasseri Division,  
Changanassery.

2. P.A. Saramma, SPM,  
T.P. Puram,  
Changanassery.

3. C.R. Indirabai,  
Postal Assistant,  
Karukachal,  
Changanassery.

4. James K.S.,  
Postal Assistant,  
Anikad,  
Changanassery.

5. P.S. Lathikakumary,  
Postal Assistant,  
Pulickakavala,  
Changanassery.

6. Mary Abraham,  
Postal Assistant,  
Pampady,  
Changanassery.

7. Union of India rep. by its  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Communication,  
New Delhi.

... Respondents

[ Mr. C.B. Sreekumar(R-1) ]

The application having been heard on 3.5.2002, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :

ORDER

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

The applicant, Postal Assistant at Changalam Post Office has indicated Anikad, Pampady or Pulickakavala as stations of her choice for transfer in her representation dated 18.1.2002. She is now aggrieved because of the 3 stations of choice indicated in her representation has now been filled by transfer of respondents 2 to 6, who had earlier been given transfer to their choice stations. Alleging that this action of the 1st respondent in discarding her representation for transfer while accepting the request of respondents 2 to 6 is arbitrary and irrational, the applicant has filed this application seeking to set aside Annexure 2 order to the extent it provides respondents 2 to 6 with posting at Anikad, Pampady and Pulickakavala and for a direction to the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders on A1 representation made by the applicant.

2. When the application came up for hearing, Shri C.B. Sreekumar took notice on behalf of respondent No.1. Shri P. Ramakrishnan, the learned counsel for the applicant says that applicant would be satisfied if the applicant is permitted to make another representation in regard to her transfer to the 1st respondent and the 1st respondent is directed to consider her request sympathetically and pass appropriate orders within a reasonable time. The learned counsel for the respondent has no objection in the disposal of this application with such a direction.

3. In the light of what is stated above, the application is

disposed of at this stage itself permitting the applicant to make a detailed representation to the 1st respondent requesting for a posting to her choice stations within two weeks from today and directing the 1st respondent that if such a representation is received, the same shall be considered sympathetically and an appropriate reply given to the applicant within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the representation. No costs.

Dated the 3rd May, 2002.



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN

oph

#### APPENDIX

##### Applicant's Annexures:

1. A-1 : True copy of representation dated 18.1.2002 from the Applicant to the 1st respondent.
2. A-2 : True copy of Order No.B/8/5/2002 dated 12.4.2002 issued by the 1st respondent.
3. A-3 : True copy of the Order No.B/8-5/99 dated 7.5.99 issued by the 1st respondent.
4. A-4 : True copy of Order No.B/8-5/98 dated 23.4.98 issued by the 1st respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

npp  
29.5.02