

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No. 350 of 1996

Tuesday, this the 30th day of April, 1996

CORAM

HON'BLE MR PV VENKATAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

V. Madhavan,  
S/o Velutha (late),  
Court Officer,  
Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Ernakulam Bench,  
Residing at "Vediathuveli",  
Mararikulam, (Via) Mararikulam North PO,  
Alleppey District.

.. Applicant

By Advocate Mr. TC Govindaswamy

Versus

1. Union of India through  
the Secretary to the Government of India,  
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions,  
Department of Personnel and  
Administrative Reforms, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary to the Government of India,  
Ministry of Finance,  
New Delhi.
3. The Hon'ble Chairman,  
Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Principal Bench, New Delhi.
4. The Deputy Registrar (Administration),  
Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Ernakulam Bench, Ernakulam.

.. Respondents

By Advocate Mr. TPM Ibrahim Khan, SCGSC

The application having been heard on 30th April, 1996, the  
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

PV VENKATAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Applicant who is working as Court Officer in the Central  
Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench, is aggrieved by the  
fact that he is facing repatriation to his parent unit. He prays  
for a declaration that the abolition of posts in the cadre of

Court Officers/Section Officers in the Central Administrative Tribunal is illegal, and prays that it may be quashed in so far as it abolishes eight posts in the cadre of Court Officers/Section Officers.

2. During the hearing, learned counsel for applicant submitted that respondents may consider the possibility of accommodating applicant in one of the adjacent Benches of the Tribunal.

3. Senior Standing Counsel for respondents referred to a letter No. PB/4/10/96-R dated 17.4.96 and submitted that it will be possible to accommodate applicant in the Madras Bench of the Tribunal, if he so applies for deputation to that Bench within one week. It was also submitted that applicant has been informed about this offer in advance.

4. Learned Counsel for applicant submitted that applicant would accept this offer and would submit his application within one week from today. Learned Counsel for applicant, however, submitted that in case there was a possibility of accommodating applicant in Ernakulam Bench at a future date, his case may be considered for a posting in Ernakulam Bench itself. It is essentially a matter for the respondents to consider, and I am sure that they will do so as sympathetically as possible.

5. I record these submissions, and dispose of the application. The interim orders of status quo passed on 21.3.96 will continue till respondents take a decision on the application made by applicant as mentioned earlier. Parties will suffer their costs.

Dated the 30th April, 1996

  
PV VENKATAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER