

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

**Original Application No. 312 of 2013**

**Monday, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2014**

**CORAM:**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Basheer, Judicial Member**

A. Anwar, Programme Executive,  
 Doordarshan Kendra, Kudappanaknnu,  
 Thiruvananthapuram – 695 043,  
 Residing at T.C. 4/1285(4), Kowdiar PO,  
 Thiruvananthapuram – 695 003.

..... **Applicant**

**(By Advocate – Mr. Vishnu S. Chempazhanthiyil)**

**V e r s u s**

1. Union of India, represented by the Secretary,  
 Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,  
 New Delhi – 110 001.

2. The Director General, Doordarshan,  
 Doordarshan Bhavan, Copernicus Marg,  
 Mandi House, New Delhi – 110 001.

3. The Deputy Director General,  
 Doordarshan Kendra, Kudappanakunnu PO,  
 Thiruvananthapuram – 695 043.

..... **Respondents**

**[By Advocates – Mr. Sunil Jacob Jose, SCGSC (R1) &  
 Mr. N.N. Sugunapalan, Sr.  
 Mr. S. Sujin (R2&3) – Not present]**

This application having been heard on 27.01.2014, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

**ORDER**


The applicant who is stated to be working as Programme Executive in Doordarshan Kendra in Thiruvananthapuram has filed this Original Application challenging Annexure A1 order of his transfer to Thrissur. It is



contended by the applicant that Annexure A1 is ex-facie illegal, arbitrary and in violation of Annexure A3 transfer policy. Applicant has raised several contentions in support of his plea that the action of the respondents in transferring him to Thrissur is totally vitiated. I do not propose to refer to or deal with those contentions at this stage since admittedly applicant has submitted Annexure A2 representation highlighting all those contentions apart from the other grievances that he has consequent on issuance of the order of transfer. But it may be noted that the respondents have got a definite case that the applicant is the senior most Programme Executive at Thiruvananthapuram and that normally persons with longest stay are transferred from one Kendra to another. Admittedly applicant has been working at Thiruvanthapuram since 2003. But according to the applicant several other officers are still continuing at Thiruvananthapuram even though they have completed longer tenure than him.

2. Be that as it may, in my view all these contentions have to be necessarily urged by the applicant before the competent authority which he has done through Annexure A2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that a decision on Annexure A2 representation will be taken by respondent No. 2 without any further delay.

3. In the above facts and circumstances, the Original Application is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to consider and pass orders on Annexure A2 representation strictly on its merit and in accordance with the rules and the policy governing the field. This shall be done as



expeditiously as possible at any rate within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Status quo as on today shall be maintained till such a decision is taken as directed above.

4. Original Application is disposed of in the above terms. No costs.

  
(JUSTICE A.K. BASHEER)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER

“SA”