

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

DATE OF DECISION

26th FEBRUARY, 1990

PRESENT

Hon'ble Shri S.P.Mukerji, Vice Chairman

&

Hon'ble Shri N.Dharmadan, Judicial Member

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.33/90

K.Sivan Pillai

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. Chief Post Master General,  
Kerala Circle, Trivandrum-33.

2. Director General,  
Department of Post  
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi-1.

3. Union of India,  
represented by the Secretary,  
Department of Post,  
Govt. of India, New Delhi. .. Respondents

Counsel for the applicant .. M/s G.P.Mohanachandran  
KR Haridas and M.Jayachandran.

Counsel for the respondents .. Mr.TPM Ibrahim Khan, ACGSC

ORDER

(Hon'ble Shri N.Dharmadan, Judicial Member)

The applicant entered service in the P&T  
Department as a Mechanic on 1.10.1965 in Trivandrum Division  
under the Mail Motor Service Unit. According to him  
he was entitled to get promotion as Selection Grade  
Mechanic on 20 percent promotion avenue that is allowed  
as per rules to various categories of staff in the M.M.S.  
Unit with effect from 1974. However, he was promoted  
only from 18.6.78. He contended that he has been deprived  
of the benefit of promotion including financial benefit

1)

Q.

...2

.2.

scale of <sup>5</sup>  
of higher pay for Selection Grade for a period of two  
years. According to him this is a recurring loss for  
him. He filed representations at Annexure I, Annexure-II,  
Annexure-IV etc. In 1982 he has been given a reply  
as per Annexure A.III, but it was only an interim reply  
without deciding the question raised by him. Hence he  
started sending further representations. Ultimately  
by Annexure A.XI he has been informed that his case  
has been referred to the Directorate and the reply is  
awaited. This is stated on 25.1.1990.

2. We are extremely sorry to note that the  
grievance of the applicant which has been highlighted  
as early as in 1978 as per Annexure A.I is even now  
pending consideration without being properly considered  
and decided by the appropriate authority. In this  
connection we must also observe that in order to avoid  
the <sup>like this on hand</sup> unsatisfactory state of affairs, it is relevant that  
the second respondent may consider the feasibility of  
establishing a machinery for early attendance to the  
grievance of the employees and granting <sup>appropriate</sup> <sup>copy of relief</sup>  
after considering the grievances highlighted in the  
representations which are being sent by the employees  
having legitimate grievance. Having regard the circumstances  
5.

.3.

of the case we feel that the interest of justice will be served in this case by directing the second respondent to consider and dispose of the representations Annexure A.X and other representations referred to therein in accordance with law. The second respondent may pass appropriate orders in accordance with law and serve a copy of the decision on the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. With the aforesaid direction we dispose of this application. There will be no order as to costs.

  
(N. DHARMADAN) 26.2.90  
JUDICIAL MEMBER

  
26.2.90  
(S.P. MUKERJI)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

26.2.90

Ksn.