

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

Original Application No.355/2006.

Friday this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2006.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER  
HON'BLE MR.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

M.Saifudheen Khan  
Assistant Engineer(Electrical)  
Postal Electrical Sub Division,  
Trivandrum-695 015. .... Applicant's

By Advocate Mr.Nagaraj Narayanan

V/s.

1. Union of India,  
Ministry of Communications,  
Department of Posts (Civil Wing),  
represented by the Secretary,  
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
2. Chief Engineer(Civil),  
North Zone, Department of Posts,  
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,  
New delhi.
3. The Chief Engineer(Civil),  
Office of the Chief Engineer,  
Postal South East Zone,  
Jayalakshmi Mansion, 6<sup>th</sup> Cross,  
Gandhi Nagar, Bangalore.
4. The Superintending Engineer,  
Postal Electrical Circle, Bangalore.

5. The Chief Post Master General,  
Department of Posts, Kerala Circle,  
Trivandrum – 695 033.
6. Department of Telecommunications,  
Ministry of Communications & IT,  
Government of India,  
1110-Sanchar Bhawan,  
20 Ashoka Road, New Delhi-I  
represented by  
Deputy Director General(Electrical). ... Respondents

By Advocate Mr.TPM I Khan SCGSC

This O.A. having been heard on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2006 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

**O R D E R**

**HON'BLE SHRI N.RAMAKRISHNAN,ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

The learned counsel for the applicant presents the case of his client that he had opted to go to BSNL in the year 2001. He had legitimate expectation of remaining in the Department though it is not substantiated by any promises held out by the respondents. The impugned order was passed on 10/3/2006. He had given representations thereafter in the month of April 2006, which has been recommended by his immediate seniors to the appropriate authorities for consideration for his being retained or absorbed in the Department of Posts. His only request is that his representation may be considered within a given time frame and till then, the impugned order be kept in abeyance. The learned counsel for



the

:3:

respondents has no objection in pursuing this course of action except the question of keeping the impugned order in abeyance.

We direct that respondents to consider his representation within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order, keeping the impugned order in abeyance till such disposal.

With this the OA is disposed of. No costs.



GEORGE PARACKEN  
JUDICIAL MEMBER



N. RAMAKRISHNAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

abp