

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No.371/2003

Friday this the 2nd day of May, 2003.

C O R A M

HON'BLE MR.T.N.T.NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

V.Padmanabhan  
S/o Venkataraman  
Trackman/Gate Keeper  
Southern Railway  
Office of the Section Engineer/Permanent Way  
Alleppey.

Applicant.

(By advocate Mr.T.C.Govinda Swamy)

Versus

1. Union of India represented by  
The General Manager  
Southern Railway  
Headquarters Office  
Park Town P.O.  
Chennai.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer  
Southern Railway  
Headquarters Office  
Park Town P.O.  
Chennai.
3. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum Division  
Trivandrum.

Respondents

(By advocate Mr. P.Haridas)

The application having been heard on 2nd May, 2003, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR.T.N.T.NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

The grievance in this application is that the applicant who was absorbed as Gangman/Trackman since February 1997 is not considered for an inter divisional transfer to Chennai inspite of A-1 application dated 27.7.98 submitted to the Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, Trivandrum, which was duly forwarded to the appropriate authority. Applicant made a further representation dated 25.9.2002 to the Senior Personnel Officer, Southern Railway, Trivandrum through proper channel. The applicant now

9/1

finds that as per A-3, personal details of Senior Trackmen/Trackmen have been called for to consider their request for inter-divisional one way transfer to Track Machine Unit (RPM), Chennai. Applicant would submit that he is entitled to be considered for an inter divisional transfer to Chennai Division/Track Machine Unit (RPM), Chennai in preference to those who are mentioned in A-3 and that non consideration of his name for this purpose would cause serious prejudice to him. Following is the main relief sought:

Declare that the applicant is entitled to be considered for inter divisional transfer to the Track Machine Unit/RPM/Chennai/Madras Division, in terms of Annexure A1 and in preference to those who are included in Annexure A3 and direct the respondents accordingly.

2. When the matter came up for hearing on admission, Sh.P.Haridas, learned counsel, took notice for the respondents. It was pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant that the applicant would be satisfied if his name is also considered along with those who are included in A-3, in the light of the representation made as early as in 1998 (A-1) and thereafter in September 2002 (A-2). The learned counsel representing the respondents would state that the application could be disposed of by directing the respondents to consider the applicant's case on the basis of his earlier requests, along with those mentioned in A-3 in accordance with the existing instructions and orders on the subject.

92

3. In the light of the statement made by the counsel on either side, I dispose of this application directing the second respondent to examine and consider A-1 & A-2 representations of the applicant on merit, in the light of the existing instructions and orders on the subject, and pass appropriate orders on them as expeditiously as possible. It is made clear that the respondents shall dispose of the applicant's request for transfer together with the case of those persons appearing in A-3, which may be considered. If necessary, the required particulars pertaining to the applicant may also be obtained before disposing of the applicant's request. No order as to costs.

Dated 2nd May 2003.



T.N.T.NAYAR  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

aa.