

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.366/05

Monday this 26th day of September 2005

C O R A M :

**HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Mary-A,
Thekkunnavila,
Puthen Veedu, Panniyodu P.O.
Residing at Eben Ezer Home,
Panniyodu P.O., Nedungad Taluk.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.M.Ramaswamy Pillai)

Versus

1. Union of India represented by its Secretary,
Post & Telegraph, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General,
Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. Superintendent of Post Office,
South Division, Thiruvananthapuram.
4. Renu B.P.,
D/o.Brammanayagam Pillai,
Radhish Bhavan, Kallikadu,
Mylakara P.O., Neyyattinkara Taluk.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.P Parameswaran Nair, ACGSC [R1-3])

This application having been heard on 26th September 2005 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :

ORDER

HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

The respondents had invited application for the appointment of Gramin Dak Sevak Branch Post Master (GDS BPM for short) at Panniyodu

Branch Post Office vide Annexure A-10 dated 1.3.2005. The applicant submitted an application for the said post on 21.3.2005. According to her she is fully qualified and fulfills all the conditions mentioned in the application. The applicant is aggrieved by the fact that she did not get the appointment and that the 4th respondent has been appointed as GDS BPM, Panniyodu. It is further submitted that the appointment was made with a malafide intention without conducting an interview and not taking into account the work experience of the applicant.

2. The respondents have filed a reply statement. It is admitted that the post of GDS BPM was notified and 43 applications were received in response to the notification and another 10 candidates were sponsored by the Employment Exchange. The applicant had also applied for the post. After considering all the 53 applications candidates were shortlisted according to merit in the qualifying examination and the short listed 5 candidates were called for verification of original certificates. The 4th respondent had secured 542 marks out of 600 in SSLC and as per merit was selected for appointment. He also has independent income of Rs.1000/- per month from tuition. It is submitted that no weightage can be given for any previous experience and no interview is prescribed in the rules and also selection is based on marks secured in the SSLC examination. Another condition prescribed is that the selected candidate should have other source of independent income and as the 4th respondent fulfills all those qualifications she was selected.

3. We have considered the above averments as well as the reply statement of the respondents. It is seen that the respondents are fully justified in their action and the applicant's prayer has no merits. The O.A is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Dated the 26th day of September 2005)


GEORGE PARACKEN
JUDICIAL MEMBER


SATHI NAIR
VICE CHAIRMAN

asp