

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.412/2000

Thursday, this the 20th day of April, 2000.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

Leena Mathew,
Junior Accounts Assistant,
Passenger Reservation System,
Southern Railway,
Trivandrum Central.

- Applicant

By Advocate Mr M.P.Varkey

VS

1. Union of India represented by
General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Chennai-600 003.
2. The Principal Financial Advisor
and Chief Accounts Officer,
Southern Railway,
Chennai-600 003.
3. The Financial Advisor & Chief
Accounts Officer(T),
Southern Railway,
Chennai-600 003.
4. Senior Divisional Accounts
Officer, Southern Railway,
Trivandrum-695 014.

- Respondents

By Advocate Mr K Karthikeya Panicker

The application having been heard on 20.4.2000, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

ORDER

HON'BLE MR A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant who was appointed as an Accounts Clerk in the scale of Rs.950-1500 under Senior Accounts Officer/T/Madras on 17.9.1987, applied for inter-divisional Transfer to the office of the 4th respondent, subject to the terms and conditions applicable to such request transfers, on 1.9.1992.

It is alleged that two persons namely, K.C.Satheeshkumar and K.Jayachandran who had registered for transfer subsequent to the applicant to Trivandrum Division have been transferred while the applicant's request has not been considered. The applicant is presently working in the office of the Passenger Reservation System, Southern Railway, Trivandrum Central on a deployment basis. The applicant made a representation to the 2nd respondent on 27.9.1999 requesting that she may be considered for transfer to Trivandrum. Finding no response to this, the applicant has filed this application for a direction to the respondents to consider the applicant's request for transfer to the office of the 4th respondent against any existing or future vacancy as per her registration priority and rules on the subject.

2. When the application came up for hearing, learned counsel of the applicant states that the applicant would be satisfied if the second respondent is directed to look into the representation submitted by the applicant(A-1) and to give her an appropriate reply within a reasonable time. Learned counsel of the respondents has no objection in adopting such a course of action.

3. In the light of what is stated above, the application is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the representation submitted by the applicant on 27.9.1999
✓ (A-1) and to give the applicant an appropriate reply in the light

..3..



of the rules and instructions on the subject within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Dated, the 20th of April, 2000.



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

trs/20400

LIST OF ANNEXURES REFERRED TO IN THE ORDER:

A-1: True copy of the representation dated 27.9.99 submitted by the applicant.