

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER 1986

Present : Hon'ble Shri Ch. Ramakrishna Rao ... Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan ... Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 1363/86(T)

M.R. Ramakrishna,  
Postal Assistant,  
Frazer Town Sub Office,  
Bangalore-560 005.

... Applicant

V.

The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Bangalore East Division,  
Bangalore-560 001.

The Director of Postal Services (Hqrs),  
Office of the Post Master General,  
Karnataka Circle,  
Palace Road, Bangalore-560 001.

... Respondents

(Shri N. Basavaraju ... Advocate)

This application has come up for hearing before this  
Tribunal today, Hon'ble Member (J) made the following:-

ORDER

This is a transferred application received from the High Court of Karnataka. The case was called out several times but none appeared for the applicant. We have, therefore, proceeded to deal with the matter with the assistance of Shri N. Basavaraju learned counsel for respondents.

2. The applicant who was working as a Postal Assistant at Bangalore in Posts and Telegraph Department, complains that his juniors were promoted to the Lower Selection Grade (LSG) by an order dated 6.1.1984 but he has been denied the promotion. It is stated in the application itself that some disciplinary inquiry was initiated against the applicant and an order of

*Am*

punishment was passed postponing increments for two years by an order dated 9.2.1983. His contention is that this punishment should not have come in the way of his promotion. Shri N.Basavaraju informs us that as soon as the period of the punishment expired the applicant was promoted to the LSG with effect from 2.2.1986. When the punishment was subsisting he could not have been promoted. Therefore, the applicant could have no grievance in this regard. After considering the matter, we are of the view that the action of the respondents in not promoting the applicant on 6.1.1984 when the punishment against the applicant was subsisting was in order. The applicant has not challenged this punishment. Obviously when a Government servant is undergoing a punishment he cannot be considered fit for promotion. On the other hand the respondents have acted with alacrity in promoting the applicant immediately after the period of punishment expired. The applicant's claim, therefore, has to fail.

3. In the result the application is dismissed. No orders as to costs.



MEMBER (J)



MEMBER (A)

bsv